

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

PROFESSOR IN THE WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO

Volume V

OCTOBER, 1921

Number 2

A HYMN OF ERIDU

By STEPHEN LANGDON, Oxford University

THIS important text is written upon a square prism similar to the Ashmolean prism, which carries a liturgy of the temple of Keš in seven songs.¹ Prisms of this kind are really prayer books which revolved about a spindle. For this reason they are pierced at the centre from top to bottom by a round hole. The Eridu prism contained about 125 lines which are not in liturgical style, but belong to the *zag-sal* or didactic group of religious texts. There is apparently no logical course of ideas in this hymn concerning the temple of Enki at Eridu; some of the phrases afford considerable help in the interpretation of the *Epic of Paradise* found at Nippur.² The mythological reference to a ship on which Enki embarks on the Euphrates, lines 80-84, recalls the bark of Ninā the water goddess of Lagash, and the legend of her ship in the "Dream of Gudea."³ Both legends were made real by a ceremony with a sacred ship and the hymn of Eridu describes the boat of Enki which was placed in the temple. Lines 70-79 certainly contain a reflection of the garden of Paradise which Hebrew tradition actually located in the region of Eridu. The Nippur legend of Paradise does not refer to Eridu and its blissful land but to Dilmun where Enki and his wife ruled

¹ See PBS. X 311 and RA. 16, 207.

² See the writer's *Poème Sumérien du Paradis*.

³ Gudea, Cyl. A II 4; IV 3 ff. The legend of the Glorification of Ishtar by Enki contains frequent mention of Enki's messenger Isimu and the "boat of heaven" by which she was transported from Erech to Eridu. *má-an-na* in this legend refers to a sacred boat of Ishtar and Anu at Erech. See, for this legend, *Poème du Paradis*, 220-257.

in Paradise. Perhaps in the most ancient geography, Eridu was included in Dilmun.

The text also contains material of much philological and technical importance. We now know that the temple of Eridu was named Esira as well as Apsû and that the city actually stood beside the Euphrates. The catalogue of musical instruments properly emphasizes the cult of Eridu as the home of music and liturgy.

The Eridu Prism belongs to the collection of DR. J. B. NIES and was published as No. 23 of *Historical, Religious and Economic Texts*, by NIES and KEISER. The photograph on plates 62-4 is a great aid in the work of editing. An important variant of Col. I as far as III 4, i.e., ll. 1-67, is the Nippur tablet 4916, published in PBS. X, No. 20. The Nippurian edition was written on two tablets. The first tablet, however, carries no colophon, and it is difficult to understand how the scribes of the Nippur library were able to keep such an edition in several tablets together. Editions of other long texts on a series of tablets are not controlled by colophon numberings and it must be supposed that the scribes knew their texts well enough to dispense with an *aide mémoire*. Lines 23 and 80 prove that Eridu was actually situated upon the Euphrates in the early period. The Sumerian name of the Euphrates, *Buranun*, "Basin of the prince," also proves the prehistoric connection between Enki of Eridu and the Euphrates.

COL. I

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. a-ri-a nam-ba-tar-ra-a-ne. | 1. O begetter who decrees fate. |
| 2. mu ⁴ ġe-ġál ⁵ dingir ù-mă ud-da. | 2. Giver of bountifulness, god who in glory issues. ⁶ |
| 3. uku-e ú-dúb-gim ⁷ ki-in-dar-ra. ⁸ | 3. Who causes people to come into being like grass. ⁹ |
| 4. en zu-ab lugal ^d En-ki-ge. | 4. Lord of the nether sea, king Enki. |
| 5. ^d En-ki en nam-tar-tar-ri-ne. | 5. Enki lord of the Fates. |
| 6. é-a-ni kug ^{dag} zagin ur-bi ba-ni-in-dū. | 6. His temple with gold and lazuli at one time hath one built. |
| 7. kug ^{dag} zagin-bi ud-kar-kar ¹⁰ -ra-dúġ. | 7. Its gold and lazuli shine like the day-light. |
| 8. éš-e zu-ab-a dú-im-ma-ni-in-dū. | 8. The domicile of the Apsu hath one made seemly. |
| 9. suġ azag galam-dúġ-ga zu-ab-ta è-a. | 9. The holy foundation made with skill rises from the nether-sea. |
| 10. en ^d Nu-dim-mud-ra mu-un-na-làġ-làġ-gi-eš. | 10. Unto the lord Nudimmud have they established it. |

11. é azag-ga mi¹¹ni-in-dū zagin-na mi¹¹ni-in-dū. 11. A holy temple hath one built, a splendid temple hath one built.
12. gal-li-eš kug-ga¹² šu-tag¹³ ba-ni-in-dúg. 12. Grandly hath one adorned it with gold.
13. Eridu-ga¹⁴ é-gú-a be-in-dū. 13. In Eridu hath one built the temple of treasures.
14. síg-bi enim-dugdug ad-gí-gí. 14. Its brick by (divine) command hath been advised.
15. gí-sal-la-bi¹⁵ gud-gim ūr-im-du. 15. Its *mast* roars like a bull.
16. é ^dEn-ki-ge gù-sil-di-di.¹⁶ 16. The temple of Enki raises the sound of chanting.
17. é-e lugal-bi-ir (gig-a) ¹⁷ ūr im-ma-an-du šar-bi¹⁸ mu-un-mà-mal. 17. The temple to its king by night reverberates with loud sound and its melodies of prayer makes.
18. lugal ^dEn-ki-ge sukkal ^dIsimu akkil im-dug-gi-im-me.¹⁹ 18. To the king Enki the divine messenger Isimu maketh lament²⁰ sweetly.
19. é im-ma-an-du gù-mu-un-na-de-e. 19. The temple is built and it proclaims prayer.
20. síg im-ma-an-du gù-mu-un-na-ab-sum-mu. 20. The brick walls are built and it utters words.
21. é kug ²¹zagin-na ki-gar-ra. 21. The temple is constructed with gold and lapis lazuli.
22. te-me-bi zu-ab-(ta) ¹⁷ a-si-gi-ga. 22. Its foundation on the nether-sea is filled in.
23. íd-zubu íd Zimbir-(ki) im-ma-ti-a. 23. By the river of Sippar it dwells.²¹
24. ²⁴sag-gul-bi gab-šu-gar nu-tuk 24. Its bar has no rival.
25. ²⁵si-gar-bi ur-mag ní-be-du.²² 25. Its bolt like a lion terrifies.

⁴ For *mud*. cf. *mú* = *banû*, and *mu* = *nadānu*.

⁵ Also a title of Sin, CT. 25, 32, 7; 24, 30, 6; 18, 10; SCHROEDER, KAV. 51, 18. Cf. CT. 8, 3 D 19.

⁶ *ud* is a variant of *ed* = *ašû*, come into being. Cf. *ud-du*, IV R. 53 I 5 with Var. *ud-da*. Chicago Catalogue of Liturgies l. 8 in AJSL. 26.

⁷ So Ni. 4916.

⁸ So Ni. 4916. Var. *dar-a-ba*. Cf. *dar* = *ašû ša iši u kanê*, II R. 62, 54.

⁹ The signs *ú-dub* = *birû*, *birîš* as in II R. II 42 g 28, but the ordinary word is *ú-šim*, v. SBP. 216, 14 and SAK. 154, III 25.

¹⁰ HAR-HAR. Var. *kar-kar* = *nubbuṭu*.

¹¹ Var. *i*.

¹² *AZAG-gi-ga*. This ideogram for "gold" is usually read *guškin*. But for a reading . . . -ga see year date 9 of Ammizaduga = VIROLLEAUD, *Ishtar*, 12, 21.

¹³ So Ni. 4916. Var. *tab. šu-tag-dúg* = *dummuṭu*.

¹⁴ Omitted on Nies prism.

¹⁵ Part of the ceremonial ship of Ea of Eridu, IV R. 25a, 19; cf. IV R. 55, 29.

¹⁶ Var. *dam*.

¹⁷ Only on the variant.

¹⁸ Var. *ru*.

¹⁹ Var. *akkil sal-zid-de-eš di*, utters lamentations faithfully.

²⁰ The passage refers to the liturgies.

26. i-lu(?) -zu ġe-im-ma-ab-?-da-ne.
 27. . . . zu gud(?) an-na sil-azag be-
 dúg-ga.
 28. . . . zu zagin-na ġiš- . . . ġùn-a.
 29. . . . zu ur-maġ
 30. . . . zu am-si-im-ūr šu
26. Thy *threshold*
 27. Thy . . . like the *bull* of heaven²³
 speaks in holy song.
 28. Thy . . . with lazuli . . . is made
 beautiful.
 29. Thy . . . like a lion
 30. Thy . . . like a wild ox

COL. II

31. zu-ab ki-sikil [me-]te-gál.
 32. é-si-ra lugal-zu ġe-im-ma-ri-in-gub.
 33. ^dEn-ki lugal zu-ab-ge.
 34. kár-zu ^{da}gug im-ma-da-an-dū.
 35. sub-sub²⁴ zagin-na im-ma-ri-in-
 gub.
 36. é ^dEn-ki-ge unû-[bi]²⁵ azag
 kurum-ag-e.
 37. gud lugal dur-*dur*(?) uš-a-sġ-ġi.
 38. ní-bi ūr-ní-du ur-bi ad-ġí-ġí.
 39. é-si-ra ^dEn-ki-ge ab-ba-azag la(l)-
 a.
 40. šag-zu-ab-ta éš-maġ ki-gar-ra.
 41. zag-zu-ta á azag-an-na.
 42. zu-ab ki sikil ki nam-tar-ra.
 43. dagal-geštug lugal ^dEn-ki-ge.
 44. . . . en nam-tar-tar-ri-ne.
 45. ^dNu-dim-mud en Eridu-ga-ge.
 46. . . . -ri-ne.
 47. Eridu-[ga . . . bar-ra be-in-dug.
 48. Eridu-ga . . . ki-be-ib-dū.
 49. ^{is}ġigir-ra azag ġe-gál sug-ga.
 50. zu-ab zi-kalam-ma kenag ^dEn-ki-
 ge.
31. O Apsu pure place of propriety,
 32. Esira, may thy king stand within
 thee.
 33. Enki lord of the nether-sea.
 34. Thy quay-wall is built with
 carnelian.
 35. Praying figures of lazuli hath one
 placed in thee.
 36. Of the temple of Enki its *hall* has
 been entrusted²⁶ to clean ones.
 37. The valiant lord of *all being*²⁷ gave
 counsel.
 38. He himself a solemn oracle straight-
 way advised.
 39. "Esira of Enki extended by the
 pure sea.
 40. Far-famed house built on the
 bosom of the nether-sea.
 41. Without thee (would prevail) the
 hand of pestilence."²⁸
 42. Apsu clean place, place of the
 decree of fate.
 43. The wide-eared lord Enki.
 44. . . . lord of the Fates.
 45. Nudimmud lord of Eridu.
 46. . . .
 47. *Eridu* hath he . . . atoned.
 48. Eridu hath he
 49. The sacred chariot is filled with
 abundance.
 50. O Apsu, breath of life of the Land
 beloved of Enki.

²¹ Ni. 4916 inserts a line here.

²² So photograph.

²³ *gud-an-na* = Ramman (?), Déc. Pl. 30, No. 10. Or Tammuz?

²⁴ Cf. PBS. X 152.

²⁵ Br. 7720?

²⁶ For *kurum-ag* = *paḫādu*, v. SCHEIL, Nouvelles Notes XXI in RT. 36.

²⁷ The phrase probably describes Enki as the creator of the ideas or designer of all things by which their being is brought into existence. For *uš* = *īemu*, plan,

- | | |
|---|--|
| 51. giš-zag-ga dū-a gal-galam-ma gub-ba. | 51. Built in wisdom, erected with grand skill. |
| 52. Eridug giš-gig-ga . . . šag-ga la(l)-a. | 52. In Eridu the shadow of . . . that on . . . is extended. |
| 53. a-ab-ba zi-zi . . . gab-šu-gar nu-tuk. | 53. The Sea . . . no rival has. |
| 54. id-maḡ . . . -zu ²⁹ kalam-ma zi-zi. | 54. The great river thy . . . brings . . . to the Land. |
| 55. ^{si} gigir-ra . . . maḡ ki-ri-gub. | 55. The wagon . . . in the far-famed . . . stands for thee. |
| 56. é-sir ³⁰ -ra ūg zu-ab šag-ga. | 56. Esirra like a lion in the midst of the nether-sea. |
| 57. . . . ^d En-ki-ge gištug kalam-ma sig-sig-gi. | 57. The . . . of Enki, bestows wisdom upon the Land. |
| 58. . . . a-bi ³¹ íd-maḡ-zig-ga-gim. | 58. Thy . . . like a mighty river in flood |
| 59. lugal ^d En-ki-ra mu-un-na-túg-a. [. . . azag-ga-ni-šú dug-ga mu-un- . . .] | 59. Unto the king Enki chants; |
| 60. ^{si} zag-sal ^{si} al-gar ^{si} balag ^{si} al-gar-sur-ra-ta. | 60. With harp, <i>algar</i> , drum and <i>algar-surra</i> . |
| 61. ^{si} HAR-HAR ³² ^{is} u ³³ sapîtum ³³ ^{si} mi-ri ³⁴ . . . si(?) -ig-ga. | 61. The <i>ḥarḥar</i> , the <i>šapîtu</i> and the <i>miri</i> fill the . . . |
| 62. ad-dug-ga buzrum-bur-ri [gà-gà?]. ³⁵ | 62. Sweet chants, the mysteries. . . |
| 63. šag im-ba dug ad ḡa-ba-ni-ib-du. ³⁶ | 63. . . . verily they sound plaintively. |

COL. III

- | | |
|---|---|
| 64. nar-balag 7-e ad ³⁸ im-mi-ib-du. | 64. Verily the seven-note flute sounds plaintively. |
|---|---|

design, see *Poème du Paradis* 172, 24 and 26, where the passages also concern Enki. Critics of my interpretation of the *Epic of Paradise* were inclined to see the word *uš* = *birku*, penis, in these lines but there can be no doubt about its meaning in line 37 above.

²⁸ *ullānukka idi ašakki*. For *azag-an*, see Sum. Gr. 204; Chicago Syllabary, 259; CT. 12, 22, 36991 R. 10; AJS. 30, 226; RA. 16, 148.

²⁹ Cf. Ni. 4916 R. 1.

³⁰ The sign appears on Ni. 4916 R. 3 and the variants *é-si-ra* (ll. 32, 39) prove that the well-known temple ÉI-D-*ra*, commonly read E-engur-*ra*, is E-sir-*ra*. The temple of Ninā at Lagash was also named Esirra, SAK. 248, and there was also an Esirra at Erech, BE. 31, 12, 6. The value of our text is that it at last furnishes the name of the temple of Ea at Eridu, and that it was also known as Apsu, as in the Code of Hammurabi II 1. Esirra of Eridu occurs in KING, *Magic*, 4, 14, Damkina the queen of Esirra and Murduk is *murîš Esirra*, "who causes Esirra to rejoice," *ibid.*, 58 R. 5; 9 Obv. 3 and Nebo is also connected with Esirra of Eridu, BL. 69, 21, and *ibid.*, No. 123, 5.

³¹ Var. *zu*, which is a better text.

³² *ḥaḥaru* ? SAI. 6500.

³³ Var. *sa-be-tum*. Cf. the *šebîtu*, *Tammuz and Ishtar*, p. 79.

³⁴ *mi-ri*, an instrument also in Gudea, Cyl. B. 10, 11.

65. ⁶⁵al-gar azag ^d.En-ki-ge ní-ba³⁸ mu-un-na-an-dū.

66. dúg-ga ^d.En-ki-ge šu-nu-bal-e-ne.

67. mu-un-du³⁹-a-ba mu-un-du³⁹-a-ba.

68. Eridu-(ki) ^d.En-ki-ge ní-ba il-il.

69. gar-sag-galam⁴⁰ ag-dé a-kalag-ba⁴¹

.....

70. zag-ga-ni giš-gí-a⁴² siġ-siġ.

71. ⁶¹²šar-siġ-ga gurun il-il.

72. mušen-e ib-bi mu-un-na-dū.

73. suġur (kua) ú-lál-e⁴⁴. . . .

74. gud (kua) gi-zi⁴⁶ túl-túl-lá

75. ^d.En-ki zi-ga-ni⁴⁷

76. zu-ab-a ù-ba-[gar-ra].

77. engur-ra ū⁴⁸.maġ

78. a-ab-ba-gim im-mu

79. íd-maġ-gim su-zi

80. íd Zimbir im-kid⁴⁹ šu

81. giš-gi-muš(?) -a-ni an-sir

82. giš-ūr⁵⁰-a-ni ki-ib

83. ^d.En-ki ū-a-ni⁵¹ muge[-gál-la]

65. The holy *algar* of Enki summons to reverence.

66. The words of Enki changed not.

67. Which he uttered, which he uttered.

68. Eridu of Enki is filled with awe.⁴³

69. To construct the stage tower "Mountain of the Land," in his power he

70. Beside it the fish pool was placed.

71. The beautiful garden was laden with fruit.

72. The birds raised distracting clatter.

73. The skate-fish spawn (?)

74. The *gud*-fish⁴⁵ of the reeds in great numbers [beget].

75. Enki his floods

76. From the nether-sea hath caused to return.

77. The reservoir a mighty flood

78. Like the sea he

79. Like the far-famed river with splendor he

80. On the river of Sippar he

81. Its oar

82. Its keel

83. Enki doth embark, he the giver of plenty.

³⁵ So Ni. 4916 R. 10. The text of the Prism is unintelligible.

³⁶ So Ni. 4916. For *dug*, the Prism has *tu*. At the end *ad-ġa-pa-ni-ib-du*.

³⁷ Var. *ad-ge-im*.

³⁸ Var. *ba*.

³⁹ Var. *dū*.

⁴⁰ General name for stage tower. Cf. BL. 137 and for the writing, CT. 32, 41, 17 etc.

⁴¹ Var. of *á-kalag*, cf. K. 4829, Obv. 13.

⁴² Certainly the same word as *giš-gi-a*, fish pond, PBS. X pl. 89, 7 and *giš-gí-a* = *apu*, cane-break, EBELING, RT. 24, 21. Cf. the *ambar ban-da* of Eridu, PBS. V 15, 16.

⁴³ *pulaḫtam malât*, IV R. 9a, 28. Cf. RA. 10, 73, 40; BL. 87, 5 etc.

⁴⁴ Cf. PBS. V 15, 6.

⁴⁵ For this fish see RTC. 32 Obv. 3; PBS. V 15, 7 et p.

⁴⁶ *gi-zi* = Semitic *kīsu* is a Sumerian word. It was borrowed from the Semitic form by the Egyptians as *geš*, *keš*. This word does not occur in Egyptian texts until after the 18th Dynasty. The Assyrian grammarians state that *kīsu* was the Egyptian word for reed but they were misled by not being aware that it was first borrowed from Egypt. MR. GRIFFITH assures me that both *geš* and *ganu* are late in Egyptian. Certainly *ganu* was borrowed from the Babylonian *kanû*. See for *geš*, BUDGE, *Egyptian Dictionary*, 804, and *keš*, p. 778.

84. ⁴⁷ má ní-bi nam-dug giš-im- 84. The fearfulness of the boat over-
whelms, it
85. é Eridu-ga-ge um-ma- 85. The temple of Eridu
86. id zu-(?)-bi-ir ad-im 86. The river
87. . . . ka-duğ-ra ka 87. . . . for the opening of the mouth
. . . .
88. ⁴⁸ En-ki-ge gū-im-ma-ab-bi bi 88. Hath Enki commanded
. . . .
89. su-uš-lal nu-gál ki-bi 89. *Uncleanness* it hath not, its place
. . . .
90. . . . zabar nu-gál-la ki-bi 90. . . . it hath not, its place
91. Nibru-(ki)-ma nar-ni 91. In Nippur his psalmist
92. máš-sib-na éš Nibru-(ki)-a im 92. His *shepherd* in the dwelling of
Nippur⁴⁹

⁴⁷ *zi-ga* = *mīlum*, PBS. V 148, 3.

⁴⁸ Sign *KAD*.

⁴⁹ Cf. *giš-ur-má* = *išid elippi*, AL.³ 88, 25; ATU. I 73, 5.

⁴⁸ Uncertain. For *ū* see I. 84.

⁵¹ For *ū* = *raḫābu*, to embark, v. SBP. 296, 19. There is clear reference here to the embarkation of Enki himself in a sacred boat, and the passage recalls the troublesome phrase in the *Epic of Paradise* Obv. III 10, which I first interpreted as a description of the embarkation of Enki himself, and later as referring to Enki's having caused Tagtug to embark.

⁵² The remaining lines of Col. III and all of Col. IV are too fragmentary for translation.

'SOUND' TERMS AND 'SHINE' TERMS

(AS ILLUSTRATED IN THE HEBREW VOCABULARY)

By HERBERT H. GOWEN, University of Washington, Seattle

THE power of audition, says Whitney, is 'closely akin with that of vision.' The general idea that impressions made upon the ear are expressible in terms borrowed from the vocabulary of vision is by no means unfamiliar. As a general idea, term transference, either way, from audition to vision or from vision to audition, is common. The subject has been treated, more or less, from the artist's point of view, in such a book as '*L'audition colorée*' by Suarez de Mendoza, and in not a few passages of artistic and musical criticism by Mr. Huneker. This latter author seems to delight in transferring the vocabulary of music to his description of painting, notably in the essay entitled: "Painted Music." He has also formed the habit of such a transference in ordinary speech, as, e.g., when he tells how 'the drums punctured space with ebon crepitations.' Some artists, as Whistler, invite Huneker's treatment of their work by describing their pictures as '*Nocturnes*,' '*Symphonies in Rose and Silver*,' and the like. There is, furthermore, somewhat abundant illustration both in colloquial speech as well as in general literature. One need only recall such expressions as 'scarlet is like a trumpet blast' or the Irish 'shriek of dawn.' Every reader will have come to mind Kipling's famous line in 'Mandalay':

"An' the dawn comes up like thunder outer China 'crost the bay."

A friend suggests that it is not impossible that the impression this last line makes upon the mind as great poetry is due in fact to the uprising of some subconscious sense of fitness formed in the age-long habit of the race.

It is the sense of fitness between the vocabulary of sound and the vocabulary of sight, and the relation of the one vocabulary to the other, that I desire to make the subject of a short paper. I would attempt to demonstrate two things: First, that Sound terms and Sight terms are almost invariably the offspring of a common im-

pression; Secondly, that, since the 'sound' term is invariably mimetic and the 'sight' term is not, that therefore the 'sound' term is primary and the 'sight' term secondary. This would further appear to be the natural order of sequence, since the primitive man would naturally resort to sounds to express emotions made upon any of the senses. So Darwin ('Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals'): "Certainly a deep sound of a prolonged *Oh!* may be heard from a whole crowd of people immediately after witnessing any astonishing spectacle." The fact may be verified by following the vocal expression of the emotion of any small boy.

In the following paper I have preferred to use the term '*shine*' for 'sight,' since the first visual impressions made upon the primitive man were evidently those made by sudden flashes of light, almost violent in their character, rather than those made by what we call color. Some years ago a paper created a good deal of interest in England which proposed a new explanation of the miracle, recorded in Josh. x, 12, of the standing still of the Sun. It suggested that the old snatch of poetry quoted from the Book of Jasher should be translated: "Sun, be dumb!" (i.e., 'cease to shine') and not: "Sun, stand thou still!", since the root דום, 'dum' could bear either meaning and it was obvious that what the Israelite leader needed was not prolonged light but rather the darkness in which his enemies should be confused and slaughter one another. The argument was not conclusive, but the passage may well furnish a starting point for my own. It is plain that דום, 'dum' may be both '*dim*,' relating to appearance (or its absence), and '*dumb*,' relating to sound (or its absence). In this case which sense is primary and which is secondary? My contention will be that the 'shine' term was the offspring of the 'sound' term. To illustrate from the passage above referred to, Josh. x, 12: דם, dam, is primarily a mimetic root, what one might call a 'stamp' word. This is true of all the variants and derivatives such as דום, dum, דמם, damam, דהם, daham, דמה, damah, דון dun, דמן, daman, תום, tum, תמם, tamam, etc. Secondary meanings of דם are: (1) The trampled-down earth, and the man created from the earth, אדמה, adhamah, and אדם, adham; (2) the color of the earth, אד, 'red'; (3) the 'red' blood, דם, dam.

Let us now pass in review the principal 'sound' terms of the Hebrew vocabulary in order that we may note: (1) Their mimetic

character, and (2) the consistent manner in which the 'shine' terms are derived from them.

i. The 'Roar' words רָא, 'ar: The obviously mimetic illustrations of this are as follows:

- i. 'ara', to roar,
 gā'ar, to growl,
 nā'ar, to growl,
 'ūr, to cry, to call out,
 'a'ar, to rouse,
 'ārav, to cry out,
 'ārag, to cry, cf. Lat. rugio.
 rāgan, to murmur,
 rāhan, to murmur,
 rā'am, to roar,
 rāhav, to rave,
 rāhag, to cry out,
 rūaḥ, rīaḥ, to breathe, to blow,
 rū'a', to roar,
 gārāh, to gurgle,
 gā'ah, to low (cf. Skt. 'gau', cow).
 rāham, to be noisy,
 rā'am, to rumble

ii. Secondary are the roots which have the sense of being lion-like and so strong, mighty. Such are the roots:

- 'ār'ā, to be strong,
 'ārāh, to be strong, powerful.

Probably also the roots אָלָה 'ālāh, אָלָה, 'ālāh, אָלָל, 'ālāl, etc., for which, however, see *infra*, under 'Yell' words.

iii. Then come the roots in which the transference has taken place from 'sound' to 'shine.' The Oriental sun has indeed come up 'like thunder.' So we have:

- 'ūr, to burn, to become bright,
 'āhar, to be luminous,
 'ārāh, to burn,
 gārāh, to glow,
 ḥārāh, to burn, glow,

ḥāarak, to roast,
 hārā', to glow, burn,
 rāgam, to love,
 rāḥal, to be glowing,
 rāḥam, to glow,
 'ūr, to glow, burn,
 yā'ar, to gleam,
 nūr, to shine,
 nāhar, to brighten up,

and other 'glow' roots, such as חרל ḥāral, חרר ḥārar, חרם ḥāraṣ, חרש ḥārash, חרת ḥārath.

2. The '*Hal*' or '*Yell*' words. It will be observed at once that the 'roar' words easily pass into the 'yell' words, since the letters R and L are interchangeable. Cf. the English, '*hurra*' and '*hello*.' It is in fact difficult to make any distinction between the significance of an ארר, 'ārar, and an אלל 'ālal. Yet it makes for clearness to put these L roots in a separate list:

i. '*Sound*' roots:

'ālāl, to lament loudly,
 hālāl, to shout,
 yābhal, יל, yul, to shout, bellow (cf. Jubilee).
 yālāl, to yell.

ii. '*Shine*' derivatives:

'ālāl, to shine,
 gāḥal, to glow,
 hūl, to be bright,
 hālam, to shine,
 tsāhal, to be bright, clear.

3. '*Call*' or '*Cry*' words. A simple strengthening of the guttural in most of the above words will give us a new set of parallels which we may speak of as '*Call*' words.

i. '*Sound*' roots:

qārā', to call,
 qūl, to call,
 qāḥal, to convoke, assemble,
 qālaṣ, to cry out,
 qālah, to convoke.

ii. 'Shine' derivatives:

kālal, to kindle,
 qāla', to roast,
 qālāh, to roast, scorch,
 qālal, to glow, glisten,
 kūr, to glow.

4. 'Hum' words.

i. 'Sound' roots:

ūm, מ, im, to hum,
 'āmar, to speak (thence 'to be high').
 hūm, to hum,
 hūn, to breathe,
 hāmam, to make a noise,
 hāmāh, to hum,
 hāman, to make a commotion,
 bāham, to be like an ox, moan,
 yāmam, to hum (hence י, yam, the sea, i.e., 'the moaner').

ii. 'Shine' derivatives:

ḥūm, to burn,
 ḥāmam, to be warm, hot,
 ḥāmar, to be hot,
 ḥāmad, to be eager, warm,
 ḥāmāh, to be hot, glow,
 kāmash, to burn,
 kāmar, to glow, burn,
 kābhash, כבש, kush, to burn,
 'ūm, to glow, burn,
 qāmash, to burn,
 yūm, to be warm (hence יום, yom, the day).
 yāmā', to be bright,
 yāmāh, to be hot,
 yāmam, to be clean, pure, bright,
 yāham, to be warm.

5. 'Dart' or 'Vibrate' words, expressive of *Flashing* and *Trilling*.

i. 'Sound' roots, indicative of sound made by rapid motion, flowing.

'ādham, to pine away, languish,

dūbh, to flow, pine away,
 dāvāh, to flow (used of a sick woman).
 dā'āh, to dart, fly swiftly,
 dābhā', to flow,
 dābhāh, to flow out,
 dāmā', to flow,
 dā'abh, to flow away,
 dāmar, to trill,
 zāmar, to trill, vibrate,
 zīmzem, to hum, buzz,
 zāmam, to hum, murmur,
 zābhabh, to buzz,
 zūph, to flow out,
 zūbh, to flow.

ii. '*Shine*' derivatives:

dāhabh, to shine, glisten,
 zāhabh, to glitter, shine,
 shābhabh, to glow, burn,
 shābhāh, to glow, burn,
 šāphar, to be bright,
 šāraph, to burn,
 tsāhabh, to shine,
 tsārabh, to burn,
 tsāraph, to glow, smelt,
 shārabh, to be hot,
 sāraph, to burn,
 tsūth, i.e. ṭṣ , tsāvath, to burn.

Note that this mimetic is, on the one hand, closely allied to '*Hum*' when the labial BH assimilates to M, and, on the other hand, to '*Tap*' when the labial assimilates to P.

6. The '*Tap*' or '*Thump*' words.

i. '*Sound*' roots:

tāphaph, to drum (cf. ṭṣ , toph, a drum).
 nathabh, to tread, trample,
 ṭabhal, to dip,
 ṭabha', to dip,
 ṭaphaph (á.λ. in Is.) to toddle, go tap-tap with a stick.

With the above cf. such words as: tambour, tabret, timbrel, tympanum, tub, dip, deep, etc.

ii. '*Shine*' derivatives:

tūph, to burn, bake (cf. תפח, Tophet).

7. The '*Puff*' or '*Puk*' words. Here the fundamental idea is of a puff of breath, produced by a sudden, even violent, opening of the lips. All the Hebrew vocabulary of 'opening' is expressed by some form of 'Pa' or 'Ba.'

i. '*Sound*' roots:

pāh, to breathe,
 pūaḥ, to puff, blow,
 nāphaḥ, to puff, blow,
 nāphak, to blow, puff,
 pāḥaḥ, to strike,
 pā'am, to strike,
 pāga', to strike, poke,
 pāgash, to strike, poke.

ii. '*Shine*' derivatives:

pūa', to shine,
 pāḥam, to glow,
 pa'er, to glow,
 nāphak, to glow, to become red.

8. The '*Knock*' words. The sense of the impact of light, suggested by the parallel vocabularies under this head, must have been very strong. The oriental sun seemed literally to '*hit*' the man who left his tent in the morning.

i. '*Sound*' roots:

nāga', to smite (espec. a musical instrument).
 nāgāh, to push, thrust, gore,
 nāgan, to strike, touch,
 nāgaph, to smite,
 nāka', to beat,
 nākāh, to smite,
 nāqam, to avenge,
 nāqaph, to strike, beat,
 naqaq, to pierce, cleave.

ii. '*Shine*' derivatives:

nāgāh, to shine, gleam,
nāqāh, to be pure, bright.

9. The '*Thwack*' roots. The idea of hitting is still more realistically illustrated in a group of roots which may be described as '*Thwack*' roots, with sundry mimetic variations such as '*Zak*,' '*Tak*,' '*Smack*.'

i. '*Sound*' roots:

tsāḥaq, to make a loud, joyous sound,
tsīah, to cry out,
tsārah, to cry out,
zārah, to cry out, shout (the same as רָחַץ, *razaḥ*, by transposition).
tsā'aq, to cry out,
shāraq, to 'shriek,'
tsāmah, to rejoice, flourish (same as תָּמַח, *tamaḥ*). Cf.

Browning: 'My life did and does *smack* sweet.'

ṭāḥan, to pound,
ṭāḥāh, to drive, thrust,
tākak, to crush,
tāqā', to 'thwack,'
tāqaph, to strike,
sha'ag, to roar,
shābhāh, to shout,
shāgāh, to cry out,
shāḥath, to break in pieces,
shū'a, to make a noise,
shā'al, to growl, howl,
shāḥal, to growl, howl (cf. שָׁחַל, *shaḥal*, a lion; Ar. *jaqala*, a jackal).
yāthaḥ, to beat with clubs.

Also such groups of '*dak*' roots as דָּוַח, *dūaḥ*, דָּוַךְ, *dūk*, דָּוַק, *dūq*, דָּחַח, *dāḥah*, דָּחַק, *dāhaq*, דָּכַח, *dāka*', דָּכַח, *dākah*, דָּכַךְ, *dākak*, דָּעַךְ, *dā'ak*, דָּקַק, *dāqaq*, etc., all used in the sense of 'striking,' 'pounding.'

ii. The '*Shine*' derivatives:

nātsaḥ, to shine,
tsāḥaḥ, to be bright,

tsāḥah, to be sunny,
 tsāḥar, to be bright,
 tsāhah, to be bright,
 tsāhal, to be bright,
 tsāhar, to shine, glisten,
 tsiāh, to be hot, sunny,
 tsāraḥ, to be clear, bright,
 ṭāḥar, to burn, inflame,
 shāḥar, to be burned,
 shāḥan, to burn,
 sāmāḥ, to be bright,
 sāraq, to be ruddy, red (cf. grapes of 'Sorek').
 mātsaḥ, to shine,
 nātsaḥ, to shine,
 nāshaq, to burn,
 zākāh, to be clear.

Note particularly the analogies in the case of such roots as:

- 'Smack': tsāmāḥ, tāmāḥ, to rejoice:
 sāmāḥ, to be bright.
 'Shriek': shāraq, tsāraḥ, to cry aloud:
 sāraq, tsāraḥ, to be red, to shine.

10. The '*Laugh*' words. Here the transference of terms from the idea of audition to that of vision is easy and obvious, since the 'shining, morning face' is the almost invariable accompaniment of the hearty laugh. But the earliest transference was probably due to the 'lowing,' 'licking' sound of spreading flames transferred to the idea of the shining of the flame.

i. '*Sound*' roots:

lā'āh, to gasp, pant,
 lā'abh, to sport, jest,
 lā'ah, to speak foolishly,
 lābhāh, to low, roar,
 lā'ag, to stammer, babble,
 lā'az, to jabber.

ii. '*Shine*' derivatives:

lābhāh, to burn,
 lābhan, to burn, parch,

lāhaṭ, to burn,
 lūdh, to burn, be swarthy,
 lāphadh, to shine,
 lāhabh, to burn,
 lāhadh, to burn,
 lūbh, to burn, parch,
 lā'aph, to burn, glow.

There are of course many other examples of this parallel in the R roots, through the interchangeability of the L and R. Whether the sun was called *Ra* or *La* (as in Polynesia) it seems probable that the first suggestion of a name was from sound rather than from shine. The distance between the 'roar' words and the 'laugh' words is of course small. We still say 'He roared with laughter.'

11. There are a few more words which have a place in the vocabulary of shining which I am inclined to call '*Break*' words. We still use such terms as 'day-break' much in the sense which was so obvious to the primitive man.

Under this heading the 'Sound' words would include such roots as:

bāraḥ, to break through,
 bārak, to break through,
 bākar, to break (by transposition),
 bālag, to break out,
 bālaq, to break out,
 pāraḥ, to break,

and a large number of other P roots.

And the '*Shine*' words will include:

bāhaq, to shine,
 bāhaṭ, to shine,
 bāḥar, to glow,
 bāraq, to send forth lightning, etc.

There are only a few words, in any way pertinent to our enquiry, which remain outside our lists. Where they occur to memory it will be found that there is no departure from the general principle which I have tried to set forth. For example, if we find such 'shine' words as

būts, to be white,
būsh, to be pale, to blush,

we find also a ready parallel in such words as:

bāzā', to tread down,
bāzāh, to put to shame.

In these last sound words the mimetic element will be plain from comparison with the English 'bash' and 'pash.'

With the larger subject of the Mimetic element in Hebrew I hope to deal at some subsequent time. This must be my present answer to those who think I have taken too much in this direction for granted. In conclusion I may say, there will probably be differences of opinion, even among those who are prepared to accept my main contention, as to the class of 'sound' words in which certain roots should be included. I may simply remind readers of Sayce's remark that 'the primitive man could only roughly distinguish between sounds, just as he could only roughly distinguish between ideas.'

THE INCANTATION TITLE \acute{E} - \acute{N} U-ŠUB

By STEPHEN LANGDON, Oxford University

IN volume III of this *Journal*, p. 36, I wrote a short note attempting to explain the meaning of the title of many Sumerian incantations. The point was that CT. 24, 27, 7 $^d\acute{E}n$ \acute{E} - \acute{N} U-ŠUB, which is there a title of the god Ea, can be combined with CT. 24, 42, 114 [$^d\acute{E}n$ \acute{E}]- \acute{N} U-ŠUB = ^{i}Ea šá pa -šá-[ri]. The combination resulted in the interpretation of this mysterious phrase, the incantation of the house of \acute{N} U-ŠUB means incantation of pardoning, or of freeing from a ban. A very vehement critic has now written eleven pages in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, Vol. 37, 51-61, in which he makes four leading points. (1) He doubts the fact of the originality of my suggestion. (2) He claims that the text of CT. 24, 42, 114 should read šá pa - ha - ri because it is parallel to CT. 25, 48, 7 and that I was not aware that the two texts are parallels. (3) That I overlooked CT. 24, 43, 122, which on the basis of my suggestion can be restored $^d\acute{E}n$ \acute{E} - \acute{N} U-ŠUB = Ea šá $ašip$ i. (4) He claims that nu -šub is an abstract formation with the same sense as nam -šub, that is $ašip$ útu, and \acute{e} - nu -šub, means house of incantation.

Now as to the first point the priority of the suggestion is not disputed and it contains, I believe, the only light which has yet been thrown upon this perplexing problem. As to the second point the critic is absolutely wrong. The text has been collated again and DR. KING's copy is correct. The sign šá is clear and ha is impossible. Naturally I knew of the seemingly parallel passage. Both texts have been cited by me many times in various works and I fail to understand the dogmatic accusation, both against the copy and the writer. As to the third point I might cry *touché* on the ground that my note was too brief, but for my purpose the exegesis was sufficiently made by the former combination. As to the last point there is not a shred of evidence for the suggestion that nu -šub can be an abstract formation. It is in fact impossible. The critic's dogmatic assertions are all erroneous.

I have recently gone into this matter again and possibly some new light can be thrown on the subject. The problem is how to read the sign *RU*. I read this sign *sub* = *mašāšu*, be bright, pure, chiefly relying upon the passage in my edition of the Tammuz text, RA. 12, 40, 13, where *é-nun-na*, "House of the prince," i.e., "house of Ea," is qualified by *nu-su-ub-ba*, "which is not purified." The objection is raised that the sign *RU* which has both values *sub* and *šub* cannot be employed in this sense. That is again an arbitrary statement, for every sumerologist knows that phonetic values are independent of their signs and if *RU* can be read *sub* there is no reason at all why it cannot be taken in this sense and for *šub* = *nadû*, throw. Note that *RU(šub)* is employed for *nadû*, *lapātu*, *makātu* throw down; for *šub* to portion out, give,¹ and for *naṣaršudu* to flee.² As to *RU* = *kuppuru* to atone, purify,³ it is uncertain whether we are to read *šub-ba* or *sub-ba* in Rm. IV 90 Rev. 18. The Sumerians read both *su-ba* and *šu-ba* for "to purify"; note *ni-in-šu-bu-un* he made splendid, Ni. 4 566, 3 in PBS. X 141; *ama-šu-ba*, the radiant mother, ZIMMERN, KL. No. 3 I 25 and RADAU, BE. 30 p. 41 n. 3. I am bound to say that it is impossible to distinguish the sibilants *s* and *š* in Sumerian, as anyone with long experience in Sumerian lexicography will confirm. In the glossary at the end of the *Sumerian Grammar* I made no attempt to distinguish most of the cases and in my opinion that is the only scientific method. The fact is, the sign *RU* can be read *sub* or *šub* in this incantation title in the sense of "atone" *kuppuru* and it can be read *šub*, cast. Both possibilities were taken into consideration in this *Journal*, III, 37 and the long dissertation of my critic to prove that I do not know the difference between *sub* and *šub* and the various meanings of these words will doubtlessly be withdrawn.

Now I am compelled again to modify my views about the reading, since working over the word *nurra* for my lexicon. It is very likely that this title is to be read in the old way *én é-nu-ru*. The four column syllabar in CT. 25, 48 on the left has *phonetic* readings for various ideograms of the god Ea. Note *lumḫa* and *dunga* as names of Ea patron of music. The line in question here is 7, where

¹ *giš-šub-ba ni-šub-bu-ne*, "They divided the property," STRASSMAIER, *Warka* 91, 23; *suk-laḡ-bi im-šub-ba*, "He gave their pure cakes," LANGDON, PBS. X 248, 6.

² *Sumerian Grammar*, 242.

³ MEISSNER, SAI. 841.

^d.*duk-sil-bur* an ideogram for Ea as god of the potter and of earthen bowls has the reading *nu(n)-ur-ra*. *Nun-ur-ra* is to be read *nú-ur-ra*, *nurra*. The word *nun* prince usually refers to Ea and is often reduced to *nú*.⁴ Note further *duk-sil-bur* glossed *ba-gar* = *paḥarum*, potter: ^{ilu}*Enlil*; SCHEIL, *Le Vocabulaire HUM*: *ḥamāšu* 106 = CT. 12, 24a, 33 and l. 107 *duk-sil-bur* glossed *nú-ur-ru* = *nurrû*: ^{ilu}*Ea* = BM. 93058 Rev. I, 1 f. in CT. 12, 21. Also ^d.*Nu(n)-ur-ra* *bāgar-gal* i.e., the god Nurrû or Nurra great potter (of Anu), MEEK, No. 24, 14 in BA. X, where this god conquers demons with his *sil-gaz* bowl. As god of the potter Ea is god of the water-bowl and hence *ša pašāri* "of atonement." See also ^d.*Nu(n)-ur-ra* *lugal nam-išib-ba* = Ea or Nurrû *bêl ašippûti*, VR. 51b, 71. ^d.*Nu(n)-ur-ra* = Ea, CT. 24, 14, 40 = 27, 9 is employed as a gloss on ^d.*duk-sil-[bur]*, 24, 14, 41. See finally my PBS. X, 340, l. 23 the *ḫagaz* or *silgaz* vessel is symbol of the god Nurrû = Ea.

It seems evident that *nurra*, *nurru* as a title of Ea originated in *nun-ur-ra*, the prince who oversees *rubû ḫāmimu*. The verb *ḫamāmu* is employed in a ritualistic sense: *me-ur-zu* = *ḫimmat paṣṣi-ka*, the conduct of thy decrees, RA. XI, 144, 9, and the Sumerian is either *ur* or *ur*. It occurs in the name of the stage-tower of Barsippa, *Ê-ur(or ur)-me-imin-an-ki*, "Temple which conducts the seven decrees of heaven and earth, or Temple of the seven conductors of decrees of heaven and earth." The incantation title *ên ê-nu-ru* would mean simply, Incantation of the house of *nu(n)-ur-ru(ra)* or of *Nurru*, i.e. Ea, and Ea is ^d.*Ên-ê-nu-ru*, "God of the incantation of the house of Nuru" = *šá pa-ša-ri* and *sá ašipî*. The restoration of my critic for CT. 24, 42, 114 [^d.*Nun-]nu-ru* is impossible and his suggestion that the text is miscopied for ^d.*Nun-ur-ru* is also erroneous. The restoration which I made [^d.*Ên-ê-]nu-ru* is most probable; [^d.*Nu-ru* is a possibility. It is necessary to make the same restoration for line 122 although it is curious that the same title is repeated.

The result of a close examination of the long criticism is that it is entirely misleading.

OXFORD,
May, 1921.

⁴ *Sumerian Grammar*, p. 287, and SBP. 160, note 8 on line 13.

LATE BABYLONIAN MORALS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

I. INTRODUCTION

To avoid needless repetition, the reader of these studies in morals is referred to the introductory remarks in the articles on "Sumerian Morals," "Early Egyptian Morals" (JSOR., 47 ff., II, 3 ff.), and "Assyrian Morals" (JSOR. IV, 1 ff.) for the point of view adopted in these investigations.

The subject of this present study is late Babylonian morals, meaning thereby the morals of the Babylonians during the period 1926-538 B.C.

In studying late Babylonian morals, it must be borne in mind that the Babylonians of the period after the end of the Hammurapi Dynasty were the heirs of Sumerian and early Babylonian culture, and what was customary in these earlier periods must be assumed to have been customary in late Babylonian times, provided no evidence to the contrary be found. It must also be remembered that Assyria inherited the same ancient culture, and was a neighbouring and related people for nearly all the period under consideration, namely from about 2000-606 B.C. Her customs will therefore be assumed for late Babylonia, unless there is good reason to suppose the contrary. Yet, in this article no use is made of any evidence other than that which is derived from contemporaneous Babylonian inscriptions.

The sources* used are: (1) Babylonian historical inscriptions; (2) Babylonian contracts and deeds; (3) Babylonian letters; and (4) a few hymns and prayers of certain date. No use has been made of the majority of poetical and religious literature, such as epics,

* For abbreviations see JSOR. I, 49. Others of less common use are: ABR. = J. Kohler and F. E. Peiser, *Aus dem babylonischen Rechtsleben*, Leipzig, 1890; KBB. = L. W. King, *Babylonian Boundary Stones and Memorial-Tablets*, 2 Vols., London, 1912; LBI. = S. Langdon, *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*, Pt. I, Paris, 1905; LNK. = S. Langdon, *Die Neubabylonischen Königsinschriften*, Leipzig, 1912; TLBL. = R. C. Thompson, *Late Babylonian Letters*, London, 1906.

legends, omens, incantations, hymns, prayers, and liturgies, because of the uncertainty of the date of nearly all such literature. It has been considered best, for the present, to base our conclusion upon only those inscriptions whose dates are certain. In this way our conclusions may be less complete than they would have been had we made use of all poetical and religious literature, but the use of this latter would have introduced a large element of uncertainty. Whereas, the picture of late Babylonian morals drawn by means of a study of material which can with certainty be dated will serve as a criterion in an attempt, which must be made sooner or later, to determine the date of all poetical and religious inscriptions in cuneiform.

On account of the paucity of our sources it will be impossible to divide the period up chronologically. Although the late Babylonian period, including the Neo-Babylonian Dynasty, covers a period of nearly fourteen hundred years, the only period which is at all fairly well documented is the last two hundred years. About conditions between 1926 and 732 B.C. very little is known. But what evidence there is leads one to conclude that during that period no material change in social and moral conditions took place. In fact, a comparison of late Babylonian morals with that of early Babylonia, of Sumeria, and of Assyria shows surprisingly little change in the whole range of Mesopotamian morals. Some changes were made—a deeper sense of social responsibility and a keener power to make moral distinctions developed, but there were no fundamental revolutions in moral thinking. Further and fuller sources may demand some change in this conclusion, but the sources at present available do not warrant a closer division than that which has been made in this series of articles on Mesopotamian morals, namely, Sumerian, Early Babylonian, Assyrian, and Late Babylonian.

Attention should also be called to the fact that the object of this study is to use evidence of religious, historical, and social conditions only in so far as they bear upon moral questions. No attempt has been made to write history or religion, nor even to depict social conditions, but an earnest effort has been made to make use of all available evidence which has a moral content. Nor has the imagination been given too much leeway in reconstructing moral

conditions. Facts have been followed rather closely, and the vividness of imagination has been restrained.

II. MORAL MATERIALS IN LATE BABYLONIAN INSCRIPTIONS

1. *Family Virtues and Vices*

In late Babylonian times, as at other periods of Mesopotamian civilization, the unit of social life was the family. And the family began with the marriage of two persons. Preliminary to marriage the consent of one or other of the parents was considered necessary (Nergl. 1). In fact negotiations were usually instituted and carried on by the parents (Nbn. 243), although this was naturally not the invariable rule. Young men often negotiated directly with the mother or father for their daughter (Nbk. 101). The purchase of brides still persisted as a custom, but the practice was becoming less common (ABR. I, 7; cf. Meissner, *Ein Entwurf zu neubaby. Gesetzbuch*, 1918, p. 288).

Marriage was a legal contract, in which the interested parties appeared before the judge with properly accredited witnesses and made their statements under oath. The bridegroom gave assurance that a bride-price had been, or would be, paid (Nbk. 101), and the bride's father handed over the marriage portion, receiving a receipt for it, or guaranteed that it would be paid at a specified time (Nbn. 243). These transactions usually took place between the bridegroom and the father of the bride, and were permanent settlements.¹ It is remarkable how formal and business-like was the marriage contract at all periods of Mesopotamian history.

Monogamy continued to be the norm, a stipulation occurring to the effect that if the man takes another wife, the first wife returns home with her marriage portion (Nbk. 101). In this we have evidence of stricter views about monogamy than at earlier periods, but yet polygamy existed,² as well as concubinage, although it was becoming less and less common. This is assumed because there is no direct evidence of polygamy in this period, unless Nbk. 101 be taken as an example, yet no law had been proclaimed against polygamy, and its existence must be assumed, on the basis of earlier practice, unless there is some definite evidence to the contrary. The

¹ F. E. Peiser, *Sitzungsberichte der Königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1889, pp. 823 ff., Laws A-K. Law C (Col. III, 3-15).

² Law K. (Col. V, 33-46).

absence of references, however, might indicate a growing discontinuance of the practice. This also might well be, since polygamy always tends to decrease according as social life becomes more complicated and competitive. The polyandry, also, of earlier days has entirely disappeared in later Babylonia.

What the impediments to marriage were, and how the marriage relationship was interrupted are matters on which the material of this period does not throw any light. It is assumed, however, that no changes from earlier custom were made. It may be assumed that divorce continued to be a legal institution, but it may have been further equalized, since it was developing in that direction in the time of Hammurapi, the wife acquiring more equal rights.

The father remained head of the family, and he, with the mother, still retained the right of selling his children (Nbk. 70). In other words, children were still considered and treated as property. The wife was inferior to the husband, but her legal rights were always recognized. She could, with her husband, sell her children (Nbk. 70), and she could legally repudiate an adopted girl (Nbk. 625). As a widow, she held rights of inheritance,³ and could remarry (Camb. 273). Women had full legal and business rights,⁴ and could enter into business as agents (Nbn. 652).

Children had legal rights, a man's own son was legally preferred to his natural son (Nbk. 109). But the children of a second marriage also had inheritance rights.⁵ Just after the end of the Neo-Babylonian period, there is evidence that a grandson was preferred, in inheritance, to his father (Cyr. 277). Children were mutually thoughtful and helpful (TLBL., No. 151), although a brother could give a brother, presumably a younger one, in pledge (Nbk. 311). If a man left two widows, the son of the first received two-thirds, and of the second one-third, and daughters were treated separately.⁶ The Code of Hammurapi made them inherit equally. Gifts were legally made by different members of the family to one another; for example, mother to son (Nbd. 65), brother to sister (Nbd. 1098), man to wife and daughter (Nbd. 334), and mother to daughter (Nbd. 368). Dowers were also legally provided. A

³ Law G. (Col. IV, 8-24).

⁴ ABR. III, 8; BA. IV, 425; I, 1 ff.

⁵ Law D. (Col. III, 16-22).

⁶ Law K. (Col. V, 33-46).

man furnished them for his wife and son (Nbd. 113), a brother for his sister (Nbd. 258), and a father-in-law for his daughter and his son-in-law (Nbd. 348).

The constitution of the family was strictly guarded by law. Registration of births, deaths, and marriages was carefully kept (Nbn. 69); no new family relationship could be entered into without legal sanction; and punishments were duly inflicted in case of violation of established law. There is also reason to believe, without any significant documentary evidence, that the relationships of the various members of the family circle were just as loving and obedient, responsible and trustworthy, as in the earlier periods of Mesopotamian family life. The Semite seemed at all times to have been devoted to the interests of his family.

2. *Social Virtues and Vices*

The constitution of society remained the same in late Babylonia as in the earlier periods. At the head stood the king, who always felt a keen responsibility for his people. On the one hand, he represented the gods, and was desirous of pleasing them and emulating them. His ideal was to hold "a sceptre of righteousness," to have "a good rule, a just sway," and to "bring peace to the people" (LBI. 98, 11-16). He loved to refer to himself as "king of righteousness,"⁷ "king of justice, who pronounces righteous judgment" (KBB. 31, 6), as "meek and humble" (LBI. 90, 2), whose ears are "open to justice and faithfulness" (LBI. 56, 7). He "desires a good and happy reign" (KB. III, 1, 148-51), and prays to the gods to give peace unto his soul and to make good the health of his body (LBI. 68, 46). He was arbitrary, but he was conscious of his responsibility to his people.

Individual consciousness was never very high among the Semites, except in commercial and business relationships. Nevertheless it was growing, and there is reason to believe that by the Neo-Babylonian period, the individual had developed a sense of his own personal rights and responsibilities which left little room for future improvement. This is brought out by the special emphasis placed upon the sin of slander (TLBL., No. 155), which indicates the growing consciousness of individuality.

⁷ J. Hinke, *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar I From Nippur*, Philadelphia, 1907; 147, 1.22.

The great regulative power in Babylonian and Assyrian life was law. It came from the gods, and was administered in their name. "the divine lords of right" (KBB. 18, 9). The oath, which guarded Šamaš and Adad were especially the great guardians of the law, the sanctity of the law, was a religious rite, whose object was to guarantee truth and reliability on the part of the people.⁸ The agents of the gods and king were the judges, who acted sometimes singly and sometimes as a college. They were assisted by a jury (*sibutu*), who were chosen from among the city elders. Lawyers were an organized institution, and witnesses, in all cases, were required. The power of attorney was necessary to agents,⁹ guarantees had to be given for the appearance of witnesses (Nbk. 366), and wills were drawn up with great detail (ABR. ii, 20 f.). Under some circumstances, settlements would be made out of court (Dar. 260), as at earlier periods, although that was considered irregular.

A keen sense of property rights had developed among the Babylonians. Rights had to be legally established before transactions could be made.¹⁰ Property rights pertained to real estate, which could be acquired by purchase, or for military service,¹¹ to tithes, which was negotiable (Nbn. 270), and to various kinds of possessions and goods (Nbd. 180, 401, 655, 1019; Ev. Mer. 24). Real estate, especially royal lands, was marked by boundary stones, which were by law inviolable (KBB).

The Babylonians were expert in trade and commerce, an inherited faculty. Great business houses were formed, and men formed alliances, for the successful prosecution of business enterprises (Nbn. 199, 572; Nbk. 88), which were legal contracts, and could only be dissolved in a legal manner (Nbk. 116). For the transaction of trade and business, legal pledges and guarantees were made (Nbn. 765, 832; Nbd. 133), bonds were given that payments should be made at specified times (Nbk. 103), and guarantees against theft were given (Dar. 93). Even securities were secured (Dar. 431, 434). Great care was taken in the regulation of wages (Nbn. 210), and a bonus (*atru*) was often offered to an agent (KB.

⁸ S. A. B. Mercer, "The Oath in Inscriptions since the time of the Hammurapi Dynasty," JAOS. 1914, No. 3.

⁹ Law A. (Col. II, 4-14).

¹⁰ Law B. (Col. II, 15-23).

¹¹ *Del. en Perse* II, 99 ff.

IV, 298 f.). Payments could be legally deferred (Nbd. 807; Nbk. 103); and one man could assume the responsibility of another's debt.¹² The individual in all business matters was held strictly responsible.¹³

Slavery remained practically the same as in previous periods.¹⁴ Slaves were acquired by purchase, capture, or debt. They were numerous, and their value was proportionate to their producing power (Nbn. 573). They were marked (KB. IV, 166 f.), and in certain cases could not exercise rights against a free man (Nbn. 738). They were treated as property, and could be held as security for the payment of a debt.¹⁵ On the other hand, they were entrusted with the care of their master's interests (Nbn. 653). They could hold and use property (ABR. I, 1 ff.), and could lend to free men, enter into partnership with them and own a scribe (Nbn. 738). In the Neo-Babylonian empire serfs almost entirely disappeared.

3. *International Virtues and Vices*

The late Babylonians, in contrast with the Assyrians, were primarily a commercial people, and tried to establish business relations with surrounding peoples, especially with the Elamites. Treaties were made even with the warlike Assyrians, but they were usually to the advantage of the latter. Nevertheless wars were common, especially with the Assyrians. They were, as formerly, religious wars, fought for and in the name of the gods. Universal levies (*ḫablu*) were made, as well as special levies (*rikis ḫabli*) from certain persons, who were responsible for the support of a soldier. These levies were in money or in kind (*dullu*).

The individual foreigner was under no disabilities in any public right during the Late Babylonian period. They had the same rights as the natives (JBAL., 114). This was also true in the early Babylonian period, although not documented for the Sumerian period.

4. *Transcendental Virtues and Vices*

Gods were numerous in late Babylonian times, as well as in the earlier periods, although Šamaš, Marduk, and Nabu were the most

¹² A. T. Clay, *Documents from the Temple Archives of Nippur* (BE. XIV), Philadelphia, 1906; No. 135.

¹³ *Ib.* No. 41.

¹⁴ ABR. I, 1; II, 6; III, 8; BA. IV, 424.

¹⁵ A. T. Clay, *Legal and Commercial Transactions* (BE. VIII, 1), Nos. 2, 28.

highly respected. Each individual had his god (LBI. 58, 13), and felt himself directly dependent upon him. The Babylonians ascribed the best they knew to their gods, although they conceived of them in a very anthropomorphic manner. The king in particular was very pious. He was mortally afraid of sinning against the gods (LNK. 252, 19-21), and continually felt the need of their protection (TLBL., No. 151). Their fear of the gods was their boast (LBI. 120, 50, 54), but it consisted in reverence, awe, and respect. It was not terror, for they loved to approach their gods; nor was it dread. It was a deep religious respect and reverence.

The centre of all religious as well as of all commercial and social life was the temple. The kings delighted in building temples to their gods. Even the Kassite kings excelled in this respect (KB. III, 152). The temples were highly endowed (KB. III, 174 ff.), a tithe being levied for that purpose (Nbn. 2; Nbd. 270), and paid collectively or individually (Nbd. 773; Nbk. 220), and in money or in kind (Nbk. 220). They possessed much property (Nbd. 428, 439), and were attended by orders of priests, and retinues of servants. Services were elaborate, but more and more emphasis was being placed upon the subordination of ceremonial to the expression of moral distinctions in hymns and prayers, although ritual ceremonies were still considered of the highest value in the worship of the gods.

III. ESTIMATION OF LATE BABYLONIAN MORALS

I. *Moral Ideals*

The epithets which the late Babylonians ascribed to their gods will indicate what their moral ideals were, for they always thought of their gods in the highest moral terms which they knew. To their gods they ascribed "justice," "truth," and "righteousness." Their word for justice was *nûs aru*, which means to be straight, and connotes a moral straightness. Their word for truth was *kânu*, which means to be firm, that which is dependable; and their word for righteousness was *immu*, right. But the laws and customs of the time will teach us what the content of these words was. This content will be the goal attained, while the goal aimed at will be the moral ideal.

What was "just" and "true" and "righteous" in family life

looked with more and more disfavour upon polygamy and concubinage, but it still tolerated slavery, although with certain amelioration. It demanded obedience, respect, and love as the elements of family relationship, and yet sanctioned the right of parents to sell their children. It differentiated between the authority of husband and wife, and punished with excess, although improvements upon earlier periods were being made.

In social life "justice," "truth," and "righteousness" were the controlling principle, but they tolerated the caste system, although this was not as marked as in the earlier periods. They retained the *lex talionis*, although with less frequency of application.

In international affairs the moral ideal was peace, but "justice," "truth," and "righteousness" remained national. It was "just" to oppress the foreigner if he sinned against Babylonia's gods; it was "true" to deceive a foreigner who worshipped other gods; and it was right to war upon him in the name of the gods of Babylonia.

What was "true," "just," and "righteous" in transcendental matters was the will of the gods; and what was good in the sight of the gods was man's highest desire (LBI. 120, 72). Yet there was no such thing as spiritual monotheism, and why should there be such a thing as monotheism at all? The more gods, the more help! It was legitimate to coerce and to coax the gods if possible, but their will was "truth," and "truth" (*kittu*) remains the same under all circumstances. The moral ideal was the will of the gods as expressed in the laws and customs of the time, and these latter we have learned to be growing more and more refined.

2. *Moral Evil*

Moral evil consisted in a transgression of the law of the gods. That law may be moral or merely ceremonial. No distinction was made between the two. Whenever the will of the gods was expressed, it was man's duty to obey and to act according to it. There was, therefore, very little distinction between moral and ceremonial sin. The words *hitu*, sin, and *limnu*, evil, may connote a purely moral misdeed or merely a ceremonial or ritual error. Both were alike displeasing to the gods, and were, therefore, "sins."

But according as social institutions developed and were refined so the content of "sin" changed. In family life "sin" consisted in

unfair treatment, and perhaps in divorce; in social relations, it consisted in perjury (Nbd. 13) and falsehood; in international affairs, it was war; and in transcendental matters, it consisted in impiety and unfaithfulness (CMI. 75, 47-48).

Evil and sin came from demons, evil spirits, and from certain gods, such as Urash and Ninegal (KBB. 18, 13-14). It thus consisted in opposition to the will of the great gods. There was no need of any metaphysical theory of the origin of evil, when the spiritual world was thus divided into two camps of deities, those who were good, and those who were evil. The moral ideal was the will of the good gods, and moral evil was the will of the evil gods.

3. *Free Will*

Predestination lay in the hands of the gods. In the hands of the gods lay the fate of mankind. What was predestined or established (*šimtu*) was irrevocable. It was written on the "Tablets of Fate," which were in the keeping of the chief gods—Enlil, Marduk, or Ašur. On the other hand, the Babylonians always exercised what is called free will on numerous occasions. Whenever he made an agreement or contract, whenever he changed his mind, and adopted a new plan of action, he exercised this power. The need of coordinating these two opposing ideas never seems to have occurred to his mind. It never presented itself to him as a problem. He went on with his daily work as if there was no conflict. His destiny lay in the hands of the gods, and when the time came, fate determined that he should die,¹⁶ but that did not interfere with the greatest freedom in daily life.

4. *Moral Sanction*

The reason for doing good or avoiding evil may be either external or internal. It may refer to rewards or punishments imposed from without, or to consequences of conduct which arise spontaneously from within. External moral sanctions were very powerful. Fear of the gods and men often defeated an intention to do wrong. Length of days, a large family, a good reign for a king, prosperity, and health of body were the most potent external moral sanctions (LBI. 110, 55-57; CMI. 60, 18). Future life in another world

¹⁶ Law G. (Col. IV, 8-24).

had no attractions. *Arallû* was a "place of desolation," and to live a long life in this world was worth more than all else.

The Babylonians' respect for law was a real internal moral sanction. He loved to do the will of his gods. Gladness and joy of heart (LBI. 110, 55-57; CMI. 60, 18) was the source of real satisfaction and was a high moral sanction in Babylonian times. To do the will of the gods was considered the surest means of attaining to joy and satisfaction of heart, and a legitimate excuse for and impetus to morality of living.

5. Conclusion

Our study of the morals of the late Babylonians as a nation has revealed certain defects. Their idea of deity, measured by modern standards, was unworthy, for while they ascribed truth, justice, and righteousness to the gods, their idea of truth, justice and righteousness was limited by their narrow conception of the domain of the gods and by their limitation of truth, justice, and righteousness to Babylonian interests. Their family relations were arbitrary, they tolerated slavery, and were excessive in punishments. On the other hand, much progress had been made—family relationships, conditions of slavery, and punishments had greatly improved. Their moral ideals were becoming purer; their sense of moral evil was becoming keener; and their moral sanctions were growing to be more internal. But on the whole they were still on a much lower level as a people than are the civilized, and especially Christian, races of the modern world.

But the individual Babylonian must be judged in the light of his own day. His moral determinants limited his moral conception. He inherited certain mental attitudes, he was surrounded by certain circumstances, and he was controlled by certain social traditions. He must, therefore, be commended or condemned according as he was true or false to the conditions, customs, and laws of his own time. We have found that he was just, true, and righteous as far as his knowledge extended; he was conscious of a certain amount of freedom of action; he was accustomed to make fine moral distinctions; he was loyal and obedient to those in authority; and he was a pious worshipper of his gods.

Finally, it has become quite clear, in the course of these studies,

that the peoples of the Mesopotamian valley were on a very high level of civilization as early as our literary monuments lead us; that they developed still higher in the course of their history, becoming especially more humane and more ideal; but that even down to the very end of their existence as a separate race they had never reached the level of Christian morality. On the other hand, the individual has been found to have always been, generally speaking, a conscientious person, never vicious, but anxious to make the best of his conditions, and actually living up to the best light of his day and generation.

May we not conclude that while religious ideas arise from divinely inspired insight, moral ideas grow and develop parallel with social custom and practice, and that the individual is generally just as moral as the laws and customs of his time? There is no universal standard of morality, for morality is ever changing with the ebb and flow of custom and law.

STRAY NOTES ON THE "A" CLASS SEGHOLATE

By FRED T. KELLY, University of Wisconsin

THE phenomenon presented by certain infinitives of the form *נָשַׁח*, *שָׁכַח*, etc., with the suffix, i.e., with *i* rather than *a* (*נִשְׁחָהוּ* etc.) as many *a* class segholates, suggests the question: "Do any considerable number of the *a* class segholates, themselves, present the same phenomenon?"

We are told that the *a* class segholates, as a rule, take *a* with the first radical in suffixed and affixed forms in the singular, as well as in the plural construct, and in certain forms of the plural before suffixes, as *מְלִכֵּיהֶן*.

A number of grammars, such as Olshausen and König, give a fairly accurate list of *a* class segholates that take *i* instead of *a*, though there seem to be some errors in these, e.g., Olshausen may be mistaken in giving the form *שָׁפְקוּ* as from an *a* class segholate, if Ges-Buhl is right in deriving it from an *i* class. So it may not be amiss to attempt some kind of a classification of these *a* class segholates.

In the lists thus far studied, not a single 3 radical noun, taking the *i* form, had a guttural as either its first or second radical, and further investigation has sustained the observation, though a number of these have the *i* in its deflected form, short *e*, as *אִפְעָה*.
מַחְצָה and *חִמְדָּה* חִלְדֵי חֲרִי חֲבֵרָה הִבְלִי

Hence, for purposes of investigation, those *a* class segholates that have either the first or second radical a guttural need not be considered, nor those with yodh or waw as second radical, because they have contracted forms before suffixes, etc. Yet we do have such forms as *הַמּוֹתָה* and *בִּיתָהּ*.

Keeping in mind the limitations suggested above of having a short vowel with the first radical, and having both the first and second radicals non-gutturals, it will be found that a considerable

proportion of these *a* class segholates take *i* in the augmented form, and in a few cases the deflected form of *i*, that is, short *e*.

As the second radical, in Hebrew, is usually the important one, we may consider the question from the point of view of the second radical.

I forms are found exclusively when the second radical is ם, ט, ן, ז, ע or ת, that is, as the examples are found in the Hebrew text. Yet it must be said that there are not many cases of the above found, viz., 3, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6, in the order given. At least, there are no *a* forms before these consonants.

With כ as a second radical, there are 12 *i* forms, as against 2 *a* forms, and one word (כִּבְשׁ) has both *i* and *a* forms.

Of those with נ as a second radical, there are 8 *i* forms, and one *a* form. In addition, there are two short *e* forms, נִנְבֵּה, נִנְדִּי.

Three *i* forms are found with ר as a second radical, and but one *a* form.

Of those having כ as a second radical, 4 *i* forms were found, and two proper nouns, with *i* and *a* from בְּכֹר. There is also one short *e* form (נִבְרִי).

Nouns with the second radical ל give 7 *i* forms and 11 *a* forms, while those with מ as the second radical give 7 *i* forms and but 2 *a* forms.

There was but one case found of an augmented *a* class segholate with נ as a second radical, viz. מְנַאֵה, and this has *a* (מְנַאֵה).

With פ as a second radical, 5 *i* forms were found, as against one *a* form, but when ר is the second radical, there are 8 *i* cases and 17 *a* forms.

Only one augmented form was found with ש as a second radical, and that has *i*.

With ש as a second radical, 11 *i* forms were found, as against one *a* form, and one form with short *e* (שִׁשְׁחָד).

To sum up; before palatals (ג, כ, פ,) there are 15 *i* forms as against 1 *a* form, and 3 short *e* forms; before dentals (ד, ט, ת), we find 15 *i* forms, with one *a* form; before the labials (ב, פ), there are 16 *i* forms and 3 *a* forms; before sibilants (ז, כ, ז, ש, ש) we have 22 *i* forms and 2 *a* forms, with one short *e* form (שִׁשְׁחָד); before the sonants (ex-

cepting ' and '), i.e., (ל', נ', י', ר'), there are 23 *i* forms and 31 *a* forms. That is, before the sonants there are more than 5 times as many *a* forms as in all the other groups. But even before the sonants the proportion of *i* forms to *a* forms is about as 3 to 4, while in the other groups taken as a whole, the proportion is a little more than 11 to 1, while of the non-gutturals as a whole, the proportion is a little more than 9 to 4, or, there are 2 and $\frac{1}{4}$ times as many *i* forms as *a* forms.

Hence, we may say that when the second radical is a sonant there is a tendency to retain the *a* vowel, but elsewhere the tendency is towards attenuating it to *i*.

In the case of the \aleph doubled segholates, of 39 forms, only 6 are *i* forms, and one of these has a guttural for the first radical. All but two of these *i* forms are found before dentals, the other 2 being followed by a sibilant (בצִיָּה) and (מִצִּיָּים).

Here, too, quite a number of the *a* forms are found before sonants, but not in the same proportion as in the three radicated words, for while there are 16 *a* forms before sonants, there are 17 *a* forms in all the other groups combined. Evidently there is not so great a tendency to attenuate the short *a* in the sharpened syllable.

With regard to the feminine participles that have endings similar to the segholate of the *a* class, and nouns with like endings (such as אֲדָרָה etc.), the augmented forms, as a rule, take short *a*. There are apparent exceptions, such as מִנְקָהּ, which seems to revert to the characteristic *i* of the Hiphil participle. Again, נִבְרָתִי probably goes back to נִבְרָה, and מַחֲשָׁהּ, to מַחֲשָׁה. However, the form מַחֲשָׁהּ is also found.

It will be noted that these *a* forms are not in initial syllables, and hence are not attenuated. Compare this with the fact that in the Piel perfect we have attenuation (קָטַל), but in the imperfect where the short *a* is protected by the preformative it remains as short *a* (יִקְטַל). The same is true of the Hithpael. Perhaps the same could be said of the Hiphil perfect in part at least (הִקְטִיל), while in (יִהְיֶה), יִקְטֵל, the short *a* remains. Perhaps this may involve the suggestion that short *i* was the stem vowel of both Piel and Hiphil.

Since the infinitive suggested the study, a word may be added with reference to the infinitives of segholate form. Those with strong consonants appearing as the two radical letters have *i* forms except קָבַח, which has the *i* deflected to short *e* (קִבַּח); with this we might compare the fact that three of the four cases we found of nouns were cases in which the short *e* was followed by palatals.

ASSYRIOLOGICAL NOTES

By STEPHEN LANGDON, Oxford University

THE DERIVATION OF THE NAME OF THE EARTH GOD EN-LIL, MULLIL, AND THE ORIGIN OF AEOLUS OF THE CAVE OF THE WINDS

IT is somewhat curious that the two most common titles of the Sumerian earth god, En-lil and Mullil, both represent him as a god of the winds. En-lil may be rendered into Semitic by *bêl šāri*, *zakīkī*, "lord of the wind" and Mullil is probably for *mu-lu-lil-la* = *bêl šāri*. The derivation of the latter word is proven by the title of Enlil in my *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms* 222, 9, *mu-lu-lil* = ¹*Lillum*; *lilû* the loanword from *lil*, wind, commonly means the wind demon *Lilû*, *Lillû*, but here *Lillum*, i.e., "wind," is a title of the earth god himself. As *mulu-lil* "lord of the wind" he is rendered into Semitic by the "Wind god." For ¹*Lillu* the Wind God as the earth god, see also CT. 15, I Col. II 2, ¹*Li-el-lum* and *ibid.*, I. 7. ^d*Lîl* or the Wind God was a title which devolved upon Ninurašā son of Enlil and Ninlil, CT. 25, 12, 21 and 24, 26, 107. Another title of the earth god is *Im-ġur-sag*, BA. V 655, 18 and SPB. 220, 1. Enlil is called *im-ġur-sag*, "wind of the under world mountain." For *ġur-sag* = *huršanu*, lower world, place of judgment, see ZIMMERN, *Zum Babylonischen Neujahrfest*², p. 3. The earth was conceived of as a huge mountain floating on the sea and the earth's god proper habitation was the vast chamber within the earth mountain whither went also the souls of the dead. ^d*Mullil šag ki-sû*, "Mullil within the earth," REISNER, *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen* 25, 22. The foundation of a temple "on the bosom of the earth" is thus described in Gudea's Cylinder A, 11, 18-23. "When my foundation record is placed and when a faithful hand is put forth for my temple, upon the "mountain" (*ġursag*) where dwells the storm wind will I (the god Ningirsu) set my foot, and straightway¹ a storm wind from the "mountain," the pure place, will I send." "Mountain" means here the interior

¹ *uš* at the beginning of line 22 is an error of dittography. Read *á-sig* = *la mašil*.

of the earth. Obviously the Sumerians believed in the popular myth of Aeolus and the Cave of the Winds and there is probably some connection between Greek and Sumerian mythology at this point. The earth god as lord of the vast chambers within the earth mountain controlled the cave of the winds and this explains his principal title in Sumerian.

Now the nether world was commonly known in Sumerian as *edin*, "the plain" where dwell the dead and to which Ishtar descended yearly in search of her lost Tammuz. The first line of a hymn recently published by SCHEIL, RA. 17, 50 is instructive concerning the original attribute of the earth god. *edin-lil-lá šag mu-lil-lá lù é ġul-ám-me lù uru ġul-ám-me*, "In the plain of the winds, within the house² of the winds, is the lord who destroys the temple, yea the lord who destroys the city." *edin-lil-lá* is translated into Semitic by *bit zaġiġi*, "house of the winds," which was a difficulty for DELITZSCH and in his *Handwörterbuch*, p. 172, he suggested that *bġtu* here may not be the same word as *bġtu* house, since it translates *edin*, plain. The difficulty is now removed by interpreting "house of the winds," by the under-world. A further difficulty is also removed. The female demon *Ardat lilġ*, "Maid of the Wind," is written in Sumerian *ki-sikil*³ *edin-na-lil-lá*, "Maid of the plain of the wind," *Babyloniaca*, IV 187, 1, but cf. 190, 2 where it is rendered *Ardat ša bit zaġiġi*. A more proper rendering of *edin-na-lil-lá* is *šġri zaġiġi*, HAUPT, ASKT. 128, 7; 121, 3. Fored in lower-world, note that Ishtar goes to the *edin-na* = *ana bġti*, REISNER, SBH. 77, 7, and *edin-na-áš* "Unto the house," i.e., lower world, SBH. 122, 16. *edin-na er-ġig mu-un-ma-al*, "Bitterly she weeps for his house," i.e., for the plain of Arallġ whither Tammuz is gone, SBH. 101, 51. Hence the plain of the winds is the abode of Enlil in the earth mountain and the Cave of the Winds is one of the most primitive myths in Sumerian religion. The name Enlil cannot be employed as an argument for a prehistoric home of the Sumerians in a mountainous and wind-swept region.

II

SUMERIAN *ugan*, STRAIGHTWAY, QUICKLY

In the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1919, pp. 190-1, DR. PINCHES gave the text of a Neo-Babylonian bilingual hymn, dupli-

² *mu* = *bġtu*.

³ For *EL* = *sikil* = *ellu*, see THUREAU-DANGIN, RA. 17, 33.

cate of a Sumerian text Ni. 9205 in Philadelphia. On the Obverse l. 15 occurs the line, *ib-ta-an-gid-i-dé u-gan-ta šeg-gà gar-bi na-nam* = *iššedad ú bi-ta-a merišta-šu šakintumma*, "It is conducted and straightway its irrigation is accomplished." The Nippur variant has *u-gan* for *uganta*. The Semitic rendering is *bitā* = *pitā*. *ugan* is probably the same word as *unga*, *ungu* = *appuna*, straightway, *Rev. d'Assyriologie* XI 144, 11. See also Gudea, Cyl. A. 8, 13, *un-gà mu-na-zig*, "straightway he hastened." A variant is *angam* = *appuna*, II R. 16, 21. A new example of the adverb occurs in the Sumerian hymn, *Rev. d'Assyr.* XVII 50 Rev. 14, *ù-gàn dū-dū ù-gàn gul-gul*, "Quickly made and quickly destroyed."

III

THE LITURGICAL SERIES *a.Babbar è-ta*

The title of this Enlil liturgy is entered in the Assyrian Catalogue, IV Raw. 53 I 5 as *a.Babbar-gim è-[ta]* and the original song (used as its first melody) is also entered at III 16. A small index of titles published by LUCKENBILL in *AJSL*. October, 1909 also contains the title *a.Babbar-gim è-im-ta*. The old compiled or *kišub* liturgy of this series, upon which the canonical composite liturgy is based, is partially preserved in MYHRMAN, PBS. I No. 8 and edited by the writer in PBS. X 309. From the precanonical liturgy the first melody of the series is largely restored. Of the tablets of the canonical series three were identified in PBS. X 167. Tablet 2 = REISNER, SBH. No. 33 (= *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms* 238-47). Tablet 5 = REISNER, SBH. No. 33 (= PBS. X 167-171). Tablet 6 = *Babylonian Liturgies* No. 73. I had only suggested that BL. No. 73 is the last tablet of the series, but K. 8207 in BEZOLD's *Catalogue* proves that the suggestion was correct. From this tablet BEZOLD gave a few lines, enough to indicate the nature of its contents. It is a liturgical ritual for the temple singers giving the title of the liturgy to be sung on each day of the month Adar, and the title of the recessional *eršemma* or song to the flute which closed each song service is also given. The liturgy ordered for the fifth day is *a.Babbar è-ta-na* and its *eršemma* is *šā-ba-ni-ge* [*mu-un-zu-a*], so restore, or *šā-ba-ni en-[na-mà]*. The *eršemma* of BL. No. 73 is *mu-lu šā-ba-na mu-un-zu-a umun a-ra-zu dé-ra-ab-bi*. "He that knows his heart, he the lord, intercession may

he speak to him." A duplicate of this *eršemma* is K. 8607 published by MEEK in BA. X 115 where the title is *mu-lu šā-a[b en-na-mà mu-un-zu-a a-ra-zu dē-ra-ab-bi]* and it has a Semitic rendering, *šā lib-bi be-lī-[ia idū tesliti likbi-šu]*. "He that knows the heart of my lord may speak intercession unto him." It is probable that the abbreviated title in K. 8207 follows this variant. This proves that BL. No. 73 is the last tablet of *Babbar è-ta*. It is difficult to understand why tablet one of *elum gudsun* in the late Babylonian corpus of prayer books, REISNER, SBH. No. 21, edited as a variant of the first part of ZIMMERN, *Kultlieder* No. 11 in PBS. X 292-298, has inserted this *eršemma* between melodies 2 and 3. See PBS. X 296, lines 10-11, where in the old Isin edition the opening lines of this *eršemma* (= SBH. No. 21 Rev. 1-14 = SBP. 114 Rev. 1 ff.) do not occur and properly so. It is not permissible in a canonical liturgy to introduce an *eršemma* or any part of it into the body of the service. It should be noted that a liturgy to the destructive word in SBH. No. 7 is a complete variant of BL. No. 73 Obverse, as far as the *eršemma*. This shows that in the prayer book *Babbar è-ta* the hymn to the Logos occurred last and was followed immediately by the recessional, a position usually occupied by a titular litany. The important ritual tablets of the *kalû* or psalmist recently published by THUREAU-DANGIN in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, XVII, 57 ff. have cleared up several important liturgical problems. The long liturgies were called *er* or Semitic *takribtu*, cf. K. 8207, *er* after the title of the liturgy *abzu pella*m and after the titles of liturgies in the Erech ritual tablets, RA. 17, 68, 28; 94, Rev. 5, etc., and for *er* = *takribtu*, see POEBEL, PBS. V 149, 10, and my *Babylonian Liturgies*, 121, 15, where the psalmist describes himself as *mu-lu er-mar-ra mèn* = *šākin takribi anaku*, "I am he that conducts the prayers of lamentation." These rituals enable us to understand precisely what Ašurbanipal meant when he said that he appeased the gods by *tak-rib-ti* and *ER-ŠAG-ĤUN-GA* (VR. IV 89). The king refers here to the public liturgies and the prayers of private penance. From the Warka ritual tablets it is now apparent that a canonical liturgy must be followed by an *eršemma* and this *eršemma* might be any old flute song appropriate to the contents of the liturgy. In the official editions of the prayer books the psalmists usually attach the *eršemma* which they regarded as regular and re-arranged it as

an intercession so that it resembles an *er-šag-ḡun-gà*. The liturgy *a-Babbar-gim è-ta* could be followed not only by its regular *eršemma*, *šab-ba-ni en-na-mà* but by *ù-'u-a-ba mu-ḡul*, "O woe for her, she is destroyed," RA. 17, 86, 6 and by *ù-li-li en-zu-mar-mar*, 17, 92, 6. The well-known ancient song to the flute to Enlil, *ni-tuk nigin-na-ám* was said after the liturgy *umun šermalla-šú an-ki-a*, RA. 17, 96, 9 and after *abzu pellam*, K. 8207, and probably after other Enlil breviaries.

IV

THE MEANING OF *BAR-ú* AFTER THE TITLES OF LITURGIES

In the Assyrian catalogue of breviaries, IV R. 53 I 34-39, six titles of prayer books are followed by the mysterious rubric *BAR-ú*. The term has been a perpetual puzzle in my work on temple services and its solution has I believe at last arrived. It seems that the same title might be employed for two similar liturgies, which means that both began with the same melody. For example the series *urú-ḡul-a-ge* is entered in the catalogue I 12 as a service for Gula. But K. 8207 refers to a series *urú-ḡul-a-ge* for Innini and adds the title of the *eršemma* for the Innini series. The recessional of "she whose city is destroyed" as sung to goddess Innini ends with the song on the flute *a.Sú-ud-ām izi-gim* in K. 8207 and the last tablet of the series, REISNER, SBH. No. 53, Reverse, has the same *eršemma* which is described, Rev. 73, as the *eršemma* or recessional of the series *urú-ḡul-a-ge* of Innini (SBP. 192-4). On the other hand *urú-ḡul-a-ge* of Gula is represented by SBH. No. 51, which has the colophon "first tablet of 'She whose city is destroyed' of Gula." It is followed by tablet two, SBH. No. 52. This tablet has the colophon, "Second tablet of 'She whose city is destroyed,'" without the definition "of Gula." Since it certainly belongs to the Gula series it is evident that, when *urú-ḡul-a-ge* occurs, as a title it means the Gula series and that the Innini series is secondary. From this it follows that SBH. No. 55, fifth tablet of *urú-ḡul-a-ge*, belongs to the original series. We possess, therefore, tablets, 1, 2, 5 of the Gula series and only the last or sixth tablet of the Innini series.

Now in line 34 of the catalogue is entered the series *é-tùr-gim nigin-na-ám* followed by the rubric *BAR-ú*, that is *aḫú*, another or

a different series of "Like a sheep-fold besieged" which is also entered at line 4 in the same catalogue. Of this series SBH. Nos. 17 + 36 represent tablet one. There were then two versions of this Weeping Mother series also and the rubric *BAR-ú* indicates this fact. This explains why the title *^dBabbar-gim è-ta-[na]* is entered at line 5 and repeated at line 35 with *BAR-ú*. The same situation exists for the series *ud-dam ki-ám-uš*, lines 6 and 36, a prayer book to the Word of Wrath (SBP. 38-55), and for *am-e amaš-a-na*, lines 7 and 37. One tablet of this series is K. 4995 in HAUPT, ASKT. edited by BÖLLENRÜCHER, *Hymnen an Nergal* No. 7. From its contents one infers that the series belonged to the cult of Nergal. On the other hand the same breviary consists of only one long melody which terminates in a prayer in the style of an *eršemma* and belongs to the cult of Enlil, SBH. pp. 130-133. This title then also refers to two similar liturgies.

REVIEWS

Orientalia. Commentarii de rebus Assyro-Babylonicis, Arabicis, Aegyptiacis, etc. Editi a Pontificio Instituto Biblico.

For Assyriologists and Sumerologists the first two parts of this excellent periodical are indispensable. The contents are all from the pen of Father Deimel—and excellent work it is. There are many interesting things in these two numbers. Deimel's study of the verbal-preformative in Sumerian is full of excellent material. He makes *mu* equivalent to the Latin *ad*, *ni* to *in*, *e* to *ex*, and *ba* to *ab*. He has, however, made a serious blunder in accepting two tablets as genuine, and publishing them in his article "Eine neue Keilschriftart." The most superficial study of the text will show that they are forgeries. Fortunately Deimel does not attempt to translate them. The most interesting article in part two is, "Die Reformtexte Urukaginas," in which Deimel shows, among other things, that Urukagina gave back to the *šangu* what the King, as patesi, had usurped from the *šangu* priesthood. There are many other valuable contributions made to the study of Sumerian, which no student of this ancient civilization can afford to miss. Misprints are rather too common in both parts, and it is hoped that more care will be exercised in the printing of future parts. It is questionable whether *é-sal* really does mean "Tempel (unserer lieben) Frau" and not "Harem," as is stated on page 12 of part two. On the whole, however, Deimel's work is most reliable.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The British Museum Excavations at Abu Shahrain in Mesopotamia in 1918, by R. Campbell Thompson. Oxford: Printed by Frederick Hall for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1920, pp. 101-144, pls. V-X.

This monograph contains a lecture, with many figures, which was read before the Society of Antiquaries on January 30th, 1919, and was published in Volume LXX of *Archaeologia*. Mr. Thompson has presented the main results of his work at Abu Shahrain in a very telling manner, and he has succeeded in adding much to our

scanty knowledge of the early inhabitants of the Tigris-Euphrates valley. He thinks that a prehistoric race occupied Eridu and other neighbouring places, who were distinct from the Sumerians, but the same as the prehistoric peoples whose remains De Morgan found at Susa. These early peoples migrated from or via Turkestan westward to Asia Minor. In this Thompson's finding would agree with the results of Hommel's recent studies in the relationship between early Turkish inscriptions and Sumerian. Mr. Thompson sees in the pottery, found at Abu Shahrain, painted in black with geometric designs, and in stone implements, the remains of a prehistoric and Non-Sumerian race. One of his plates gives one a good idea of this painted pottery.

If Thompson is right in the deduction he draws from the discovery of numerous fresh-water mussel shells at Abu Shahrain, we are compelled to give up the idea that Eridu was in ancient times actually situated on the shore of the Persian Gulf. These and other matters make Thompson's Monograph of first importance.

A new text which the author publishes on p. 115 and transcribes and translates on the following page is most interesting, for it represents Nur-Immer, King of Sarsa, as a devoted priest of the temple of the Sun-god, as well as the restorer of the buildings of Eridu, and builder of a temple for Enki. Thus Taylor's work so well begun in Abu Shahrain over sixty years ago has been ably continued by Mr. Thompson. We await Thompson's further work in the East with keen interest.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

An Old Babylonian Version of the Gilgamesh Epic. By Morris Jastrow and Albert T. Clay. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920, pp. 106, pls. VII.

Two recently discovered texts have thrown a flood of light upon the famous Gilgamesh Epic. The first, acquired in the spring of 1914 by the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, was identified by Dr. Poebel as part of the Gilgamesh Epic, and published in monograph form by Dr. Langdon in 1917, in the *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania Museum, Babylonian Section*, Vol. X, No. 3. Langdon furnished a transliteration and translation

with notes and introduction. In 1914 also Yale University bought a tablet, which has been found to be a continuation of the Pennsylvania tablet, the two tablets belonging to the same edition of the Gilgamesh Epic. Jastrow and Clay here present the text, with a transliteration and translation and introduction, of the Yale tablet, and also the results of their study of the Pennsylvania tablet, after a careful collation of Langdon's text with the original tablet. This collation was made by Dr. Chiera. As a result of their study they have been able to make many corrections in Dr. Langdon's work, a full list of which are given in this work as an appendix. It is, however, to be regretted that they do not publish their corrected text. They, however, give credit to Langdon for his work, and might have added that the work of a pioneer is always of peculiar difficulty.

A close study of the whole Epic has resulted, it seems, in the following deductions: There are two parts in the Epic, one which has to do with a mighty warrior, by name Enkidu (not Eabani), preserving a faint tradition of the conquest of Amurru by that hero; and the other which records a more definite recollection of the exploits of Gilgamesh (or Gish), as invader of Babylonia, whose home was likewise, perhaps, in the West. To both Enkidu and Gilgamesh are transferred certain nature myths and didactic tales, and in this process of transference Gilgamesh usurps the place of Enkidu as chief hero. The Epic is probably earlier than the Hammurabi dynasty, but was later redacted. Indeed, the earlier version may have been Sumerian and the later Semitic, although Clay and Jastrow hold that the Semites were the earlier settlers in the Tigris-Euphrates valley. It is too early to pronounce upon Clay's theory of Amurru, and so Jastrow is conservative in his statements about matters which touch the West. But aside from that, this work under the joint authorship of Jastrow and Clay brings us vastly forward in our understanding of the Gilgamesh Epic. This is not the place to take up in detail their differences with Langdon, but it must be said that their renderings are very often real improvements and the translation of the Yale tablet is very well done.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Beiträge zur Morgenländischen Altertumskunde. By Fritz Hommel. Munich: Autographed by the author, pp. 32.

In 1920 Professor Hommel issued an autograph of the first part of his *Beiträge*, under the title, "Zu den babylonischen Grenzsteinsymbolen." This is the first of several parts which the author intends to publish. Later they will be supplied with a printed title and preface, and will be published by the G. Franz'sche Buchhandlungen in Munich. In the first part, the author begins by giving a chronological bibliography. This is followed by a discussion of the different symbols that are found on the Boundary Stones, and an interpretation of their astronomical significance. A concordance of the signs of the Zodiac as they appear on the various Boundary Stones is then presented.

Part two of the *Beiträge* is entitled, "Die beiden ältesten babylonischen und ägyptischen Heiligtümer," in which Professor Hommel shows the close relationship between EN and NUN of Sumerian thought and *pr-we* and *pr-nw* of Egyptian thought. In a brief review, it is impossible to go into the details of Hommel's argument. But there is no doubt that he has rendered his thesis highly probable. At any rate, his discussion is packed with original thought and brilliant suggestions. His work is of the highest importance, and no student of Sumerian or Egyptian religion can ignore it. As extra *Beiträge*, Professor Hommel has issued a strong argument for the astral order of the Graeco-Phoenician alphabet, under the title, "Zur astralen Anordnung des Phönizisch-Griechischen Alphabets." This is a timely discussion, and demands careful consideration.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Zwei hundert sumero-türkische Wortvergleiche als Grundlage zu einem neuen Kapitel der Sprachwissenschaft. Von Fritz Hommel, Munich: Autographed by the author, pp. 32.

In 1915 Professor Hommel put in final form the result of many years of research along the lines of comparative Sumero-Turkish philology. This result is highly instructive. First comes a series of *Vorbemerkungen* on the use of the affix in noun-building. After that follows an alphabetical list of Sumerian words with their Turkish equivalents. Some of the comparisons are very remark-

able, others are not quite so obvious. Several of the latter occur in the second *Nachtrag*. But the number of probable equivalents is so great as to render Hommel's thesis exceedingly reliable. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that Campbell Thompson, in his recent lecture on his excavations at Abu Shahrain, lays emphasis upon the belief that the earliest Sumerians probably came from or via Turkestan.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die sumerische Tempelstadt. Von A. Schneider. Essen: Bae-deker, 1920, pp. 120. M. 36.

This is the fourth part of a series of monographs on *Staatswissenschaft*, edited by Johann Plenge. Dr. Anna Schneider has made a thorough and discriminating study of Sumerian business and social institutions, and has placed all students of ancient civilization in her debt. Although the author does not say so, her work clearly shows that, in reality, in ancient Sumeria the temple was the centre of all life, civil as well as ecclesiastical, and, consequently, when she says that store-houses for corn were older than temples, she contradicts what the results of her study show. As a matter of fact, we have no knowledge of a time in Sumerian history when temples did not exist. Sumerian economic life always centered in the temple.

A perusal of this little book is highly instructive. In the earliest Sumerian times, trade was carried on in kind as well as in money, silver was used, but perhaps not in minted form, and business procedure was highly developed. Of course, there is much yet to learn about early Sumerian economic life, but Dr. Schneider has successfully brought together most of what is known on the subject up to the present time. It might be remarked that perhaps *Pa uru*, on page 107, should be translated "mayor."

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Babylonisch-assyrisch aläku "gehen." By Carl Bezold. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, pp. 75.

This monograph is an advance sample of the Babylonian-Assyrian Dictionary which is being prepared by Professor Bezold and which will be issued under the patronage of the Academy of Science of

Heidelberg. Bezold's ambition is to do for Assyriology what is being done, in the form of a great dictionary, for Egyptology, under the leadership of Erman. Professor Bezold takes the word "*alāku*," and without printing all the material which will be found, in the future dictionary, under this word, shows what the dictionary will be like. I know personally that Bezold has an enormous amount of material at hand, but I fear that it will be humanly impossible for any one man to accomplish the task which this indefatigable scholar has assumed. In fact, what is being done under Erman's leadership by many scholars, cannot be done for Assyriology by any one man. However, one has only admiration for a man who has attempted such a task as that which Dr. Bezold has planned. This sample manifests a wealth of learning, and should be examined by every Assyriologist.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Patesis of the Ur Dynasty. By C. E. Keiser. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919, pp. 34.

The purpose of this book is to present a chronological and synchronistic list of the so-called patesis of all the Babylonian cities mentioned in the published material. The number of such cities Dr. Keiser finds to be forty-two, and the number of patesis corresponding to them to be eighty-five. Dr. Keiser's monograph is highly interesting not only from a historical point of view, but likewise from a religious standpoint. On page 12 his deductions about the relationship between a patesi and the temple may have to be considerably changed if, as seems probable, it turns out that one's relationship to a temple did not necessarily involve a purely religious relationship, because Babylonian civic and social life, whether religious or not, revolved around the temple. In other words, the temple was the centre of civil as well as of religious life. This book has thrown much welcome light upon the nature, duties and responsibilities of the patesiate. For example, the patesiate was not hereditary; the office of patesi was subject to the authority of the crown; a patesi could be removed from office or even deposed; he was not exempt from taxation; and he possessed the right of making legal decisions. It should also be noted that at least seven of these patesis have the divine determination before their names.

But of course they were not deified. A child of Bur-Sin, namely Dun-gi-ra-ma, also has the divine determinative.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Chronology of the Larsa Dynasty. By E. M. Grice. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1919, pp. 43.

This the first part of volume four of the "Yale Oriental Series" is a gathering together of all known chronological material relative to the problem of the Larsa Dynasty. Dr. Grice has placed all students of Sumerian history and chronology in her debt, by so arranging her material that it may be conveniently used by them. Nor is the monograph unimportant for students of Sumerian grammar, for the author has recorded in her footnotes many variant verbal and nominal forms which are of great value.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Some Explanatory Lists and Grammatical Texts. By Theophile J. Meek. Paris: Leroux, 1920.

This is a reprint of an article which appeared in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, Vol. 17. It is a series of texts from the British Museum, which the editor copied during the summer of 1914. Only the texts are presented, the editor promising complete discussions for the future. Most of these texts are published for the first time and will be eagerly studied by Assyriologists. The texts are mostly Explanatory Lists, which are very valuable for grammatical and lexicographical work. There are also some Grammatical Texts, and also a few Syllabaries. The texts appear to be excellently copied, and specialists in cuneiform are very grateful to Professor Meek for his excellent work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die Denkmäler des Pelizaeus-Museums zu Hildesheim. Von Günther Roeder. Berlin: Karl Curtius Verlag, 1921, pp. 218, with 78 illustrations and 16 plates.

Dr. Roeder has issued a most interesting and informing guide to the valuable collection of Egyptian antiquities in the Pelizaeus Museum in Hildesheim. In his introduction Roeder refers to the founder of this museum, and the collector of the majority of the

antiquities. Herr Pelizaeus is an example of what has taken place so often in Europe—a public-spirited man of affairs interesting himself in the finer arts of culture and civilization, and giving of himself and his wealth to bring to his countrymen the means of appreciating the antecedents of our present civilization. This ought to be a lesson to our rich American men of culture and wealth.

But the book is not merely a guide. It begins with a short history of Egypt, of her art, literature, and religion, and then discusses Egyptian customs, utensils, furniture, etc., period by period, illustrating all by reference to objects in the Museum. A perusal of this book would give one a fairly complete picture of what Egyptian family, social, and religious life was. Dr. Roeder's Guide is a model of what such books should be.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Das alte Aegypten. Von A. Wiedemann. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1920, pp. 446. Mk. 30 + Valutaausgleich.

Under the editorship of W. Foy, Carl Winter in Heidelberg has begun the publication of a *Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek*. So far three volumes have appeared, the above being the second in the series. As a book for the general reader, prepared by an Egyptologist, no better author could have been procured than Wiedemann. Erman and Sethe are primarily linguists. But while Wiedemann knows his Egyptian grammar, his interest has been more in the religious and general cultural side of Egyptology. And so we have here, what might have been expected from Wiedemann, a good general discussion of Egyptian life and civilization.

After an introduction dealing primarily with the sources of our knowledge about Egypt, the author presents a clear picture of the land and people of Egypt, after which he devotes a chapter to Egyptian origins. It is to be noted here that Wiedemann is very careful in his statements about the possible relationship between Egypt and Babylonia. He realizes that there is a strong Semitic element in Egyptian language, religion, and civilization, such as all real students of Egyptology have noticed, but he declines to be party to any extreme position, such as some are tempted to assume. Egypt came into close contact with the Semitic world,

but she never became quite a Semitic people. Her language in form-structure is Semitic, but in word-structure is African, with, of course, a sprinkling of foreign, and especially Semitic, words.

Section four of the book is devoted to the main purpose of the book, namely, to describe the culture and civilization of Egypt. State, society, law, dress, and dwellings are clearly described. Business, war, hunting, manufacture, trade, and food are also carefully described. The Chapter on religion is carefully done, although one misses here, as well as in the section on society and law, a full appreciation of the moral character of the ancient Egyptians. Finally, art, literature, language, and science come in for an intelligent and well-balanced treatment. The work is well illustrated, there being seventy-eight drawings in the text and twenty-six figures on a series of plates at the end. The index is good, and a full list of abbreviations will be found useful. But best of all, the author has furnished complete references. This book is the best of its kind.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Short Egyptian Grammar. Mercer-Roeder. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921, pp. 88 + 56. \$2.50.

In 1913 Dr. Günther Roeder brought out a convenient and inexpensive little pocket-manual of the Egyptian language. Professor Mercer of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, at once recognized its usefulness and with the author's permission made an English translation. This was completed in 1915, but, held up for five years by the war, has only recently appeared in print. So simplified a presentation is of course affected but little by the detailed grammatical studies which Sethe and others have meanwhile published.

The treatise is introduced by a bibliography, which Professor Mercer has changed as much as possible to an English basis by adding English works and giving English translations, when they exist, in place of foreign originals. Maspero's "Contes populaires" (p. xiii) could properly be included in the latter group. The magnificent new Leyden publication, with its text available in either German or Dutch, might well be mentioned in the "Museums" section. Two new headings introduced, "Periodicals" and "Bibliography," form desirable additions to the list.

In going through Professor Mercer's translation one is first impressed by its smooth English. Then suddenly some unfamiliar statement appears, which upon investigation is found to involve a slight misinterpretation. Thus the pharaonic title "the strong ox" (p. 9) should be "the strong bull"; and on p. 18 the fact brought out by Roeder is not that the definite article "lasted into the classical period," but that it occurred sporadically even that early. Again, Roeder's German translations of Egyptian cannot always be put into equivalent English without reference to the Egyptian original. So in the vocabulary *w'y r* is rendered "to bow to" instead of "to tend toward, be inclined to"; *why-t* is called "stem" instead of "tribe"; and *n mrw-t* appears as "therewith" instead of "in order that."

It is to be regretted that Roeder's chief *raison d'être* for his German version, its low price, does not apply to the translation, for the latter is listed at \$2.50. Even so, a modern beginner's book in so attractive and convenient a form as Professor Mercer has provided should do much to popularize the study of Egyptian among English-speaking students.

T. GEORGE ALLEN

Volume LI of the Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (Shanghai, 1920) contains the usual melange of popular and scientific articles and indicates that in materialistic Shanghai there is a group of people interested in scholarship and letters. W. Clifton Dodd's *Relation of Chinese and Siamese* gives a history of the Tai migrations but does not touch on ethnological and linguistic matters in a way that the title of the paper might lead one to suppose. *Greek and Chinese Art Ideals* by Arthur Stanley, Honorary Curator of the Shanghai Museum, is a popular, historical comparison. Evan Morgan's *Destiny, Fate*, surveys the Chinese conception of *moira* and *anangke* and comes to the conclusion that the Chinese idea is much like that of Napoleon but not the profound pessimism of Omar, as rendered by Fitzgerald. Dr. Chatley's *China's Petrified Sun-Rays* gives some interesting information about coal. *Chinese Ideas of Antiques* by the Rev. J. Hutson should be read by everyone interested in curios and curio collecting and especially by those who revere antiques of the later

Victorian period. Mr. Hutson deals with millenniums as if they were weeks and displays real erudition on lutes, jades, coppers and porcelains. The most interesting article is the illustrated paper by Mrs. Ayscough on Chinese Poetry and its Connotations. It is really an introduction to the background necessary to the reader of Chinese verse. Manners, customs, and social data of all sorts are presented and a valuable list of Chinese ideographs is given to explain just how the picture in the character assists the Chinese poet. In each of his words for "bright," e.g., there is some stroke or element which connotes to his readers an overtone which the mere user of type cannot get, even though he be learned in the classics and versed in etymology. Mrs. Ayscough makes a most interesting comparison with the modern Imagist school. There are a number of other articles mainly of local interest and several book reviews. Some of the latter are marred by a lack of understanding of real philological science. Thus, in a recension of Karlgren's monumental work on Chinese Phonology, there appears the absurd statement that few languages are really phonetic, Welsh, perhaps, being the most nearly so. The Editors of the Journal for some years past have been giving way to philological obscurantism which hurts the reputation of the annual in the scientific world. It may be worth while to note that the Society has a membership of 517, of whom about half live in Shanghai.

GEORGE H. DANTON

